HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 37815 of 2026

Sakina Bano @ Soni And 6 Others

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Mohd Naushad, Syed Irfan Ali
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	Ajay Srivastava, G.A.

Court No. - 76

HON'BLE SAURABH SRIVASTAVA, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for applicants and Sri Ajay Srivastava, learned counsel for opposite party no.2 as well as learned AGA for State.

2. Present application has been preferred with the prayer to quash the chargesheet dated 16.5.2026 and cognizance/summoning order dated 01.07.2026 along with entire criminal proceedings of Case No. 581 of 2026 (State Vs. Sakina Bano @ Soni and others), arising out of Case Crime No. 121 of 2026, under Sections 191(2), 115(2), 333, 351(3), 324(2) BNS, P.S.- Mohammadabad, District Ghazipur.

3. Learned counsel for applicants argued that applicants have been falsely implicated in the present case by opposite party no.2 only to harass them, whereas by bare perusal of the narration made in the FIR, there is hardly any allegation levelled against applicants upon which trial can proceed. In fact, applicant no. 4 is daughter-in-law of opposite party no. 2 and applicant no. 4 has lodged several complaints including under Section 12 of Domestic Violence Act, 2005 and under Section 144 of BNSS. Only to create pressure upon applicant no. 4 to withdraw all those pending cases, opposite party no. 2 falsely implicated applicant no. 4 and her family members by way of lodging present false FIR on the basis of concocted story. The injuries examined and reported by the concerned doctor are simple in nature. No specific role has been assigned against the applicants only general allegations have been levelled against them. No credible evidences have been collected during course of investigation against

applicants. Learned counsel for applicants has further submitted that the present criminal proceeding is abuse of process of law. Learned counsel for applicants further submitted that if there is hardly any allegation levelled against applicants then under which circumstance, the concerned Investigating Officer submitted chargesheet against them whereupon without applying its judicial mind, learned court concerned took cognizance of offence over the said chargesheet which is bad in the eye of law and as such, same may be quashed. In support of his submissions, learned counsel for applicant placed reliance upon a judgment passed by Hon'ble the Apex Court in the case of **State of Haryana Vs. Bhajan Lal [1992 Supp (1) SCC 335].**

4. Per contra, learned counsel for opposite party no.2 as well as learned AGA vehemently opposed the prayer as made in the application by way of submitting that the contentions, which are sought to be raised on behalf of applicants, would relate to disputed questions of fact, and would involve appreciation of evidence.

5. After having the rival contentions raised by learned counsel for parties and perusal of the entire material available on record, this Court finds that no case is made out against applicants for proceeding with the trial since the allegations as made against applicants in the FIR are entirely vague in nature. No specific role has been attributed to the applicants and only general allegations have been levelled against them. Moreover, no credible evidence has been collected during course of investigation which would corroborate the prosecution story. In a similar matter, in the case of **Sanjay D. Jain & others Vs. State of Maharashtra & others [2025 LiveLaw (SC) 960]**, wherein Hon'ble the Apex Court has held that if the allegations as made were entirely vague in nature and in the absence of any details whatsoever it could not be said that even a *prima facie* case had been made out for proceeding with the trial.

6. In the case of **Mahmood Ali and others vs. State of U.P. and others** (Criminal Appeal No. 2341 of 2023, decided on 08.08.2023), Hon'ble the Supreme Court observed that when an accused comes before the High Court, invoking either the inherent power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. or the extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution, to get

the FIR or the criminal proceedings quashed, essentially on the ground that such proceedings are manifestly frivolous or vexatious or instituted with the ulterior motive of wreaking vengeance, then in such circumstances, the High Court owes a duty to look into the FIR with care and a little more closely. It was further observed that it will not be enough for the Court to look into the averments made in the FIR/complaint alone for the purpose of ascertaining whether the necessary ingredients to constitute the alleged offence are disclosed or not as, in frivolous or vexatious proceedings, the Court owes a duty to look into many other attending circumstances emerging from the record of the case over and above the averments and, if need be, with due care and circumspection, to try and read between the lines. .

7. In **Bhajan Lal (supra)**, Hon'ble the Supreme Court had already set out the broad categories of cases in which the inherent power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. could be exercised. Para 102 of the decision reads as follows:

> *'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 give 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 Act concerned (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 Act concerned, 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.'

8. The case in hand, the allegations against the applicants, such as they are, are wholly insufficient and, prima facie, do not make out a case against them. Further, they are so farfetched and improbable that no prudent person can conclude that there are sufficient grounds to proceed against them. In effect, the present case falls squarely in categories (3) and (7) set out in **Bhajan Lal (supra)** and as such, permitting the criminal process to go on against the applicants herein in such a situation would, therefore, result in clear and patent injustice. This is a fit case for exercising its inherent power under Section 528 BNSS to quash entire proceedings. However, it is made clear that if any grievance whatsoever has arisen in favour of opposite party no. 2 still persists, the same can

only be redressed before the proceedings which are pending before learned court concerned under the Domestic Violence Act, 2005.

9. In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances as well as in light of said decisions of Hon'ble the Apex Court, chargesheet dated 16.5.2026 and cognizance/summoning order dated 01.07.2026 along with entire criminal proceedings of Case No. 581 of 2026 (State Vs. Sakina Bano @ Soni and others), arising out of Case Crime No. 121 of 2026, under Sections 191(2), 115(2), 333, 351(3), 324(2) BNS, P.S.-Mohammadabad, District Ghazipur, are hereby **quashed qua applicants herein**.

10. Accordingly, the instant application is **allowed**.

(Saurabh Srivastava,J.)

October 29, 2026
Shaswat

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