



2026:AHC:127043-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
CRIMINAL MISC. WRIT PETITION No. - 9697 of 2026

Mintu Yadav

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Ajay Kumar Vashistha
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 40

HON'BLE AJAY BHANOT, J.
HON'BLE LAKSHMI KANT SHUKLA, J.

The petitioner has sought for the following reliefs:

"(i) Issue a writ order or direction in nature of certiorari quashing the impugned First Information Report dated 15.04.2026 as Case Crime No. 119 of 2026 Under Sections 109(1), 191(2), 191(3), 190, 221, 126(2), 121(1), 132, 115(2), 352, 351(3) of BNS and 7 Criminal Law Amendment Act, Police Station Sahawar, District Kasganj.

(ii) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent authorities not to arrest the petitioners pursuance of First Information Report dated 15.04.2026 as Case Crime No. 119 of 2026 Under Sections 109(1), 191(2), 191(3), 190, 221, 126(2), 121(1), 132, 115(2), 352, 351(3) of BNS and 7 Criminal Law Amendment Act, Police Station Sahawar, District Kasganj"

Learned AGA submits that briefly put the prosecution case set out in the FIR is that the accused persons tried to forcefully prevent a Sobhayatra which was being escorted by police authorities. The accused persons started attacking the police force with stones and bricks. A large number of police personnel sustained grievous injuries in the incident. A video of the incident was also recorded in which the accused persons have been identified. Learned AGA further submits that the FIR discloses a prima facie commission of offence wherein police authorities were attacked and prevented from discharging their law and order duties. The aforesaid offences create a law and order situation in the area. The offence as disclosed in the FIR warrants investigation.

Shri Ajay Kumar Vashistha, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated by the police.

Per contra, learned A.G.A. on behalf of the State and submits that the F.I.R. as well as materials in the record establish prima facie commission of the offence. Staying the arrest of petitioner at this stage would impede the investigations. Challenge to an F.I.R. and grant of interim protection has to be examined in light of law laid down by the Supreme Court in State of **Haryana v. Bhajan Lal reported at 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335 and Neeharika Infrastructure Private Limited Vs. State of Maharashtra and others reported at (2021) 19 SCC 401.**

The aforesaid submissions could not be satisfactorily refuted on behalf of the petitioner.

Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. The F.I.R. discloses prima facie commission of cognizable offences and warrants an investigation into the same. The petitioner is identified as one of the principal offender in the FIR. Grant of interim protection at this stage will not only compromise the investigation but may also cause the loss or disappearance of evidence. Moreover, in the facts of this case such a course of action will be in the teeth of law laid down in **Bhajan Lal (Supra) and Neeharika (Supra).**

While stating the grounds on which the FIR can be quashed by the Court in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the Supreme Court in **Bhajan Lal (Supra)** held as under:

"102. In the backdrop of the interpretation of the various relevant provisions of the Code under Chapter XIV and of the principles of law enunciated by this Court in a series of decisions relating to the exercise of the extraordinary power under Article 226 or the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code which we have extracted and reproduced above, we have given the following categories of cases by way of illustration wherein such power could be exercised either to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice, though it may not be possible to lay down any precise, clearly defined and sufficiently channelised and inflexible guidelines or rigid formulae and to give an exhaustive list of myriad kinds of cases wherein such power should be exercised.

(1) Where the allegations made in the first information report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused.

(2) Where the allegations in the first information report and other materials, if any,

accompanying the FIR do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code.

(3) Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused.

(4) Where, the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155(2) of the Code.

(5) Where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

(6) Where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the concerned Act, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party.

(7) Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.

103. We also give a note of caution to the effect that the power of quashing a criminal proceeding should be exercised very sparingly and with circumspection and that too in the rarest of rare cases; that the court will not be justified in embarking upon an enquiry as to the reliability or genuineness or otherwise of the allegations made in the FIR or the complaint and that the extraordinary or inherent powers do not confer an arbitrary jurisdiction on the court to act according to its whim or caprice."

The Supreme Court in **Neeharika (supra)** expounded the law as under:

"33.16. The aforesaid parameters would be applicable and/or the aforesaid aspects are required to be considered by the High Court while passing an interim order in a quashing petition in exercise of powers under Section 482CrPC and/or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. However, an interim order of stay of investigation during the pendency of the quashing petition can be passed with circumspection. Such an interim order should not require to be passed routinely, casually and/or mechanically. Normally, when the investigation is in progress and the facts are hazy and the entire evidence/material is not before the High Court, the High Court should

restrain itself from passing the interim order of not to arrest or "no coercive steps to be adopted" and the accused should be relegated to apply for anticipatory bail under Section 438CrPC before the competent court. The High Court shall not and as such is not justified in passing the order of not to arrest and/or "no coercive steps" either during the investigation or till the investigation is completed and/or till the final report/charge-sheet is filed under Section 173CrPC, while dismissing/disposing of the quashing petition under Section 482CrPC and/or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India."

The judgments rendered by the Supreme Court in **Bhajan Lal (Supra)** and **Neeharika Infrastructure (Supra)** are squarely applicable to the facts of this case and dissuade us from granting any interim protection to the petitioners.

Faced with this, Shri Ajay Kumar Vashistha, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioners do not wish to press the relief for quashing of the F.I.R. in the writ petition.

In wake of the submissions made by Shri Ajay Kumar Vashistha, learned counsel for the petitioner the relief for quashment of the FIR is declined.

Shri Ajay Kumar Vashistha, learned counsel for the petitioner recasts his relief and submits that the petitioner may be granted liberty to approach the competent court for seeking appropriate remedies available with him under the law.

It is always open to the petitioner to avail other legal remedies as may be advised.

The writ petition is disposed of.

June 12, 2026
Vandit

(Lakshmi Kant Shukla,J.) (Ajay Bhanot,J.)