SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			WPCRL/2263/2026 Mayank Yadav & others --Petitioners **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand & others --Respondents **Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.** Mr. Harsh Vardhan Dhanik, learned counsel for the petitioners (appeared through V.C.). 2. Mr. Baskar Chandra Joshi, learned AGA for the State. 3. Petitioners have impugned the FIR No.0306 of 2026 dated 28.09.2026 under Sections 109 (1), 351(2) and 352 of BNS, 2023, registered with Police Station Transit Camp, District Udham Singh Nagar. 4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the present FIR has been lodged in counterblast to the FIR lodged by the father of the petitioners. He further submits that, in fact, in the incident which is said to have taken place on 28.07.2026, it was the petitioners who sustained severe injuries. The first information report was lodged by the father of the petitioners on 29.07.2026 at 22:15 hours at Police Station Transit Camp, District Udham Singh Nagar, being FIR No.0232 of 2026, under Sections 109(1), 351(2) and 352 of the BNS, 2023. He also submits that the impugned FIR was lodged almost two months after the incident, on 28.09.2026, upon the intervention of the Court, when the application

submitted by the complainant of the impugned FIR under Section 175(3) of the BNSS, 2023, was allowed.

5. I have perused both the FIRs. Both the FIRs speak about the selfsame incident, which took place on 28.07.2026 at about 03:00 p.m. Since the incident is admitted by the parties, in which one of the parties sustained more injuries, whereas, in the impugned FIR, the injured allegedly did not suffer any injury, it is not necessary for constituting an offence under Section 109 of the BNS, 2023 that injuries should also be there.

6. In view of the aforesaid, this Court feels that the impugned FIR *prima facie* discloses the commission of cognizable offence, and no case for quashing the FIR is made out. Thus, no interference is warranted. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed in-*limine*.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
05.11.2026

AK

AVNEET KAUR