2026:AHC:210049-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. WRIT PETITION No. - 10261 of 2025

Karan Pal Singh And 2 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Kartikeya Shukla, Ravi Shukla, Ved Prakash Tiwari
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	G.A., Jeeshan Ahmad Siddiqui, Kanhaiya Lal, Mohammed Iftekhar

Court No. - 47

HON'BLE RAJEEV MISRA, J.
HON'BLE JAI KRISHNA UPADHYAY, J.

1. Case called out in the revised list.

2. Even though the name of Mr. Kartikeya Shukla and Mr, Ved Prakash Tiwari are duly published in the cause list as counsel for the petitioners, but neither they nor anyone on behalf of petitioners are present to press the writ petition even in revised call.

3. Learned AGA representing State-respondents 1 and 2 and Mr. Zeeshan Ahmad Siddiqui, Advocate representing respondent 4, Mamta Rani are present.

4. Perused the record.

5. Petitioners Karan Pal Singh and 2 others have approached this Court by means of present criminal misc. writ petition challenging the impugned FIR dated 04.04.2025 lodged by first informant respondent 4, Mamta Rani and registered as Case Crime No. 0082 of 2025 under Sections 498-A, 323, 377, 504, 506 IPC and 3/4 Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961, Police Station - Mahila Thana, District - Muzaffar Nagar.

6. Present writ petition came up for admission on 20.05.2025 and this Court passed the following order:-

"1 Heard Shri Kartikeya Shukla and Shri Ved Prakash Tiwari, learned counsel for the petitioners and

learned AGA for State respondents.

2. The instant writ petition has been preferred for quashing the impugned FIR dated 04.04.2025 being Case Crime No.0082 of 2025 under Sections 498-A, 323, 377, 504, 506 IPC and 3/4 Dowry Prohibition Act, P.S. Mahila Thana, Distt. Muzaffar Nagar and for a direction to respondents not to arrest the petitioners pursuant to impugned FIR.

3. It is contended that the impugned FIR has been lodged falsely implicating the petitioners. There is matrimonial dispute between the informant and her husband (son of petitioner nos.1 and 2). The petitioners have no concern in the instant matter. The first petitioner has also disowned his son (husband of the informant). In this regard, reliance has been placed on the notification dated 14.08.2024, which was made in the local newspaper. It is contended that the petitioners being parents and friend have falsely been implicated with concocted story just to create pressure. It is contended that the petitioners are innocent and in case no reprieve is accorded, the petitioners would suffer irreparable loss and injury. Learned counsel for the petitioners, in support of his submissions, has placed reliance on the judgments in Geeta Mehrotra vs. State of U.P. and others, 2012 (10) ADJ 464 and Taramani Parakh vs. State of Madhya Pradesh and others, (2015) 11 SCC 260.

4. The matter requires consideration.

5. Issue notice to respondent no.4, returnable at an early date. Steps may be taken within a week.

6. All the respondents are accorded four weeks' time to file counter affidavit. One week, thereafter, is accorded to file rejoinder affidavit. List thereafter.

7. Until further orders, the petitioners shall not be arrested pursuant to impugned FIR, provided they cooperate with the investigation in question."

7. Upon perusal of order sheet we find that the interim order dated 20.05.2025 was never extended.

8. In view of above, in all probability the present writ petition has been rendered infructuous. It is accordingly dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.

9. Interim order, if any, shall stand vacated.

(Jai Krishna Upadhyay,J.) (Rajeev Misra,J.)

October 6, 2026
S.K.S.

Digitally signed by :-
SUNIL KUMAR SINGH
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad