



2026:AHC:63979-DB

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD**

**CRIMINAL MISC. WRIT PETITION No. - 22021 of 2025**

Siddhant Pandey @ Mayank

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

---

|                           |   |             |
|---------------------------|---|-------------|
| Counsel for Petitioner(s) | : | Mohd. Israr |
| Counsel for Respondent(s) | : | G.A.        |

---

**Along with :**

**1. Criminal Misc. Writ Petition No. 25490 of 2025:**

Sunil Kumar Pandey and 2 others

Versus

State of U.P. and 2 others

---

**Court No. - 47**

**HON'BLE J.J. MUNIR, J.**

**HON'BLE TARUN SAXENA, J.**

When the case is called on, Mr. Mohd. Israr, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Rajeev Kumar Rai, learned counsel for the respondent no. 3 and Mr. Shashi Shekhar Tiwari, learned A.G.A. on behalf of the State are present.

This petition and connected Criminal Misc. Writ Petition No. 25490 of 2025 have been taken up together for admission with Criminal Misc. Writ Petition No. 22021 of 2025 preferred by the husband treated as the leading case.

The writ petition preferred by the husband is against the impugned FIR giving rise to Case Crime No. 0196 of 2025, under Sections 85, 115(2), 352, 351(3) of B.N.S. and Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, Police Station Sarpataha, District Jaunpur.

We had referred the parties to the Allahabad High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre for endeavouring a mediated settlement of the dispute. A reference was made, subject to deposit of Rs. 30,000/-

within two weeks and an interim stay order also granted, limited to 08.01.2026. In this case, there is an office report, saying that the mediation centre report is on record. The mediation centre report dated 06.11.2025 indicates that the petitioner did not deposit the sum of Rs. 30,000/- necessary for initiation of the process of mediation.

Accordingly, the petitioner has lost his right to the attempt through the process of mediation. It goes without saying that by virtue of the order dated 09.10.2025, the interim stay order granted has come to an end automatically.

We now proceed to consider the case of the petitioner in the leading case and the connected writ petition on merits, that is to say on the question of admission.

Heard Mr. Mohd. Israr, learned counsel for the petitioner in support of the motion to admit these petitions to hearing.

This writ petition is directed against the impugned FIR giving rise to Case Crime No. 0196 of 2025, under Sections 85, 115(2), 352, 351(3) of B.N.S. and Section 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, Police Station Sarpataha, District Jaunpur.

A perusal of the impugned FIR shows that it has been lodged by respondent no. 3, Smt. Shradha Tiwari @ Neetu with allegations to the effect that she was married to the petitioner in the leading case, Siddhant Pandey @ Mayank, a resident of Lucknow, on 08.06.2025. The marriage was settled in the sound Indian tradition of elders decided, whom the young man and woman would marry. The choice was proposed by the groom's mother. The parties were married according to Hindu rites at a temple (Mandir) situate in Vrindavan Colony, Lucknow. The informant, who is the wife, says that her family gave away in dowry sum of about Rs. 5 lacs. The parties embarked on their new journey. However, within a week of the marriage, the informant's husband, that is to say, the petitioner in the leading case and his sister Richa Pandey commenced torturing the first informant physically and mentally, on account of the frugal

dowry that she had brought. The informant's father-in-law, Sunil Kumar Pandey, an employee in the Home Department of the Government of Uttar Pradesh, would join the husband and the sister-in-law of the informant and beat her up. The informant's husband, Siddhant Pandey, suffered from ill health and consumed psychotropic drugs. Thereafter, he would beat up the first informant in the night and attempt carnal relations against the course of nature. He would bring pressure upon her to adopt the christian faith, in which, he had the support of the informant's sister-in-law, Richa Pandey. The informant, after being fed up of this torture that she underwent in her in-laws' home, called her brother Yashwardhan Tiwari on 21.07.2025. When her brother arrived, her in-laws beat him up and abused him. The informant's ornaments and clothes were snatched away. The informant and her brother were pushed out of the house in Sector - C, Aliganj, Lucknow, telling them that they cannot come back again to this house, unless they brought a four-wheeler or a good two-wheeler like a Bullet motorcycle.

Learned counsel for the petitioner says that all these allegations are false and the first informant has suppressed from the Court the fact that she was earlier married and divorced, where too, she had resorted to legal proceedings against her husband for cruelty etc. Learned counsel for the petitioner wants us to accept his submission that the first informant is a troublesome women, who is prone to walking out of marriages and given to initiate legal proceedings against the husband, without any basis. He says that there is no injury report to substantiate the allegations of assault etc.

At this stage, we have been informed by the learned counsel for the informant that this was a second marriage for Siddhant Pandey too, and learned counsel for the petitioner is quick to point out that he has disclosed this fact in paragraph no. 15 of the petition.

In the totality of circumstances that obtain, we are not inclined to be swayed by the fact that this is a second marriage for the parties, and on that basis, look upon the character or conduct of either of them with suspicion. We are concerned with the impugned FIR and its

validity, because it is the petitioners in the leading case and the connected writ petition, who want us to quash the FIR.

A careful reading of the FIR shows that there are thick allegations of mental and physical cruelty, coupled with demand of dowry, with full particulars given. These kinds of allegations are required to be investigated. Since it was a family dispute, we ourselves thought that parties should be given a chance to reconcile and had referred the matter to the Mediation Centre. Unfortunately, the petitioner in the leading case, who is the husband, skirted our offer and did not avail the facility.

In the totality of circumstances, we do not find any good ground to interfere with the first information reports impugned.

Both the writ petitions **fail** are summarily **dismissed**.

(Tarun Saxena,J.) (J.J. Munir,J.)

**March 26, 2026**

SK Srivastava