2026:AHC:227775

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 45358 of 2026

Himadri Maurya And Another

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Aditya Yadav, Sandeep Kumar Kushwaha, Shivam Yadav
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 76

HON'BLE SAURABH SRIVASTAVA, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicants and learned AGA for the State.

2. The present application has been preferred for seeking quashing of chargesheet dated 29.05.2026 and cognizance order dated 11.08.2026 along with entire proceedings of Criminal Case No.2193 of 2026 (State Vs. Himadri Maurya and another), arising out of Case Crime No.57 of 2026, under Section 351(3), 352 of BNS, P.S. George Towan, District Prayagraj, pending in the court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Court No.10, Prayagraj.

3. Learned counsel for applicants has made only one submission before the Court that offences under Section 351(3), 352 of BNS are non-cognizable and in view of the explanation to Section 2(1)(h) of BNSS, the charge sheet filed by the Investigating Officer concerned cannot proceed as a police case and the same is liable to be proceeded with as a complaint case. In support of his submission, learned counsel of applicants has placed reliance upon the judgment passed in the case of **Shakila Bano and others Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2008 (61) ACC 636**.

4. Since the argument as advanced on behalf of learned counsel for applicants, is based on legal issue, no notice is required to be issued to opposite party no.2.

5. Although, learned AGA opposed the prayer sought through the instant application but did not dispute the submissions so made by learned

counsel for applicants.

6. Before proceeding further, the relevant provisions of Section 2(1)(h) of BNSS are being reproduced for ready reference as under:-

> *"2. Definitions.-(1) In this Sanhita, unless the context otherwise requires,-*
>
> *(h) "complaint" means any allegation made orally or in writing to a Magistrate, with a view to his taking action under this Sanhita, that some person, whether known or unknown, has committed an offence, but does not include a police report.*
>
> *Explanation.- A report made by a police officer in a case which discloses, after investigation, the commission of a non-cognizable offence shall be deemed to be a complaint; and the police officer by whom such report is made shall be deemed to be the complainant."*

7. In view of the above explanation, charge sheet submitted by the concerned Investigating Officer in the present case under Section 351(3), 352 of BNS, should have been treated as complaint and it is to be decided as complaint but the learned Magistrate fell in legal error by taking cognizance as State case and the orders passed by him is, therefore, liable to be set aside.

8. In view thereof, order dated 11.08.2026 passed in Criminal Case No.2193 of 2026 (State Vs. Himadri Maurya and another), arising out of Case Crime No.57 of 2026, summoning the applicants on the basis of chargesheet submitted by concerned Investigating Officer under Section 351(3), 352 of BNS treating the same as State case, is set aside.

9. Accordingly, the instant application is **partly allowed**.

10. However, it is made clear that this order shall not preclude the learned court concerned to proceed with the case treating it as complaint case, if required, in accordance with law.

(Saurabh Srivastava,J.)

November 2, 2026
Vivek Kr.

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