



2026:AHC:57348-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. WRIT PETITION No. - 25738 of 2025

Vikram Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of Uttar Pradesh And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Pradeep Singh Sengar
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 47

HON'BLE RAJEEV MISRA, J.

HON'BLE DIVESH CHANDRA SAMANT, J.

1. Heard Mr. Himanshu Vikram Singh, the learned counsel for petitioner and the learned A.G.A. representing State-respondents 1& 2.

2. Perused the record.

3. Petitioner-Vikram Singh has approached this Court by means of present criminal misc. writ petition challenging the F.I.R. dated 23.9.2025 lodged by first informant- respondent 3 Sub-Inspector Santosh Kumar Rai and registered as Case Crime No. 0208 of 2025, under Sections 3/5A/8/5B of Uttar Pradesh Prevention of Cows Slaughter Act, 1955 and Section 3/25 Arms Act, 1959, Police Station-Bhanwarkot, District-Ghazipur.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner in challenge to the impugned F.I.R. submits that petitioner is the owner of the vehicle in which cow and its progeny were being transported. It is then contended by the learned counsel for petitioner that petitioner has no concern with the purpose of transportation of cow or its progeny. As such the criminal prosecution of petitioner cannot be sustained in law and fact. He, therefore submits that in view of above, the impugned F.I.R. is liable to be quashed by this Court.

5. Per contra, the learned A.G.A. representing State-respondents 1& 2 has vehemently opposed the present writ petition.

6. Learned A.G.A. submits that pursuant to the impugned F.I.R. dated 23.9.2025, the vehicle of the petitioner must have been seized by the concerned police personnel. There is nothing on record to show that the petitioner has initiated proceeding for the release of his vehicle.

7. Apart from above, no pleading has been raised in the present writ petition to demonstrate and establish that the transportation of cow or its progeny was being made for the purpose of transporting them within the State and not taking them outside the State. No pleadings have been raised in present writ petition that the cow and its progeny were not being transported for the purpose of slaughtering. The name of the person who took the services of petitioner's vehicle has also not been disclosed in the present writ petition. He therefore submits that in view of above, no good or sufficient ground has emerged so as to quash the impugned F.I.R. As such present writ petition is liable to be dismissed.

8. When confronted with above, the learned counsel for the petitioner could not overcome the same.

9. Having heard the learned counsel for petitioner, the A.G.A. representing State-respondents 1 & 2, and upon perusal of record, we find that the objections raised by the learned A.G.A. in opposition to the present writ petition are clearly borne out from the record. Furthermore, the same could not be dislodged by the learned counsel for the petitioner with reference to the record at this stage.

10. In view of the above, this writ petition fails and is liable to be dismissed.

11. It is accordingly **dismissed**.

12. Interim order if any stands vacated.

(Divesh Chandra Samant,J.) (Rajeev Misra,J.)

March 19, 2026

ADY