HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. WRIT PETITION No. - 26420 of 2026

Chedilal And Another

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Amit Kumar Verma, Chandrawati
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 48

HON'BLE CHANDRA DHARI SINGH, J.
HON'BLE HARVIR SINGH, J.

1. The present writ petition has been preferred with the following main reliefs:-

"i) issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned F.I.R. dated 14.09.2026 registered as Case Crime No. 0317 of 2026 Under Sections 191(2), 190, 115(2), 351(3), and 110 of B.N.S. 2023, Police Station Mauaima, Ganganagar (Commissionerate Prayagraj) (Annexure no.1 to the writ petition);

ii) issue a writ order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent no.2 not to arrest the Petitioners in pursuance impugned F.I.R. dated 14.09.2026 registered as Case Crime No. 0317 of 2026 Under Sections 191(2), 190, 115(2), 351(3), and 110 of B.N.S. 2023, Police Station Mauaima, Ganganagar (Commissionerate Prayagraj) (Annexure no.1 to the writ petition)"

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner, after some length of arguments on merits, submitted that since the maximum punishment prescribed for the offences alleged in the impugned F.I.R. is up to seven years, he confines his prayer to an innocuous relief that the police authorities may be directed to comply with the mandatory procedure as laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of of ***Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar*** reported in ***(2014) 8 SCC 273*** before effecting the arrest of the petitioner.

3. Per contra, learned A.G.A. appearing on behalf of the State vehemently opposed the petition on merits but he has no objection to the innocuous prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners.

4. Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, learned

A.G.A. appearing on behalf of the State and perused the record.

5. Considering the fact that the offences as levelled in the F.I.R. are punishable with imprisonment up to seven years only, coupled with the innocuous prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners and no objection expressed by learned A.G.A., thereto, this Court is inclined to allow the said innocuous prayer.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the authorities concerned to ensure the procedure of arrest as per the guidelines of the Supreme Court enshrined in the case of **Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar** reported in **(2014) 8 SCC 273** and the mandate of Section 35(3) of B.N.S.S.

(Harvir Singh,J.) (Chandra Dhari Singh,J.)

November 2, 2026
Pravin

Digitally signed by :-
PRAVIN VERMA
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad