2026:AHC:226763

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 45198 of 2026

Raju Singh @ Raju Lodhi And 2 Others

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Sharad Chand Rai
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 charge-sheet dated 03.09.2025 along with cognizance/summoning order dated 24.09.2026 as well as entire proceedings of Criminal Case No.2412 of 2026 (State vs. Millu and others) arising out of Case Crime No.330 of 2025, under Sections 115(2), 352 and 351(3) BNS, P.S. Khaga, District Fatehpur, pending in the court of learned Civil Judge (Junior Division/ Judicial Magistrate), Khaga, District Fatehpur.

3. Learned counsel for applicants has made only one submission before the Court that offences under Sections 115(2), 352 and 351(3) BNS are non-cognizable and in view of the explanation to **Section 2(1)h 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 judgments passed in the case of **Murli and others Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2008 (61) ACC 54; Virendra Singh and others Vs. State of U.P. and others, 2002 (45) ACC 609 and Shakila Bano and others Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2008 (61) ACC 636**.

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

5. Before proceeding further, the relevant provisions of **Section 2(1)h 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."

6. In view of the above explanation, charge sheet submitted by the concerned Investigating Officer in the present case under Sections 115(2), 352 and 351(3) BNS shall be treated as complaint and it is to be decided as complaint and 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.

7. Since the legal issue has been raised by learned counsel for the applicants and as such process to issue notice to opposite party no.2 is hereby dispensed with.

8. In view thereof, cognizance/summoning order dated 24.09.2026 passed by learned Civil Judge (Junior Division/ Judicial Magistrate), Khaga, District Fatehpur against the applicants on the basis of charge-sheet submitted by concerned Investigating Officer under Sections 115(2), 352 and 351(3) 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.

November 2, 2026
Ashish/-

(Saurabh Srivastava,J.)

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