2026:AHC:211301

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 482 No. - 43860 of 2024

Mohammad Yaseen

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Bhupendra Pal
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 73

HON'BLE DR. GAUTAM CHOWDHARY, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant, learned A.G.A. for the State and perused the material brought on record.

2. The present application under Section 528 BNSS has been filed with the prayer to quash the charge sheet dated 21.05.2024, cognizance order dated 27.05.2024 as well as entire proceedings of Case No. 11306 of 2024 (State Vs. Udit Mishra and others), arising out of Case Crime No. 01 of 2024, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 34 I.P.C. and Sections 66C, 66D of I. T. Act, Police Station Cyber Crime, District Kanpur Dehat, pending in the court of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kanpur Dehat.

3. The contention of learned counsel for the applicant is that no offence against the applicant is disclosed and the present prosecution has been instituted with a malafide intention for the purpose of causing harassment. He pointed out certain documents and statements in support of his contention.

4. At this stage, the argument raised by learned counsel for the applicant involves adjudication of a factual dispute and appraisal of evidence.

5. From the perusal of the material on record and looking into the facts of the case at this stage it cannot be said that no offence is made out against the applicant at this stage. All the submissions made at the bar, relate to the disputed questions of fact, which cannot be adjudicated upon by this Court under Section 528 BNSS. At this stage only prima facie case is to be seen in the light of the law laid down by Supreme Court in cases of **R.P. Kapur Vs. State of Punjab, A.I.R. 1960 S.C. 866, State of Haryana Vs. Bhajan Lal, 1992 SCC (Cr.) 426, State of Bihar Vs. P.P.Sharma, 1992 SCC (Cr.) 192** and lastly **Zandu Pharmaceutical Works Ltd. Vs. Mohd. Saraful Haq and another (Para-10) 2005 SCC (Cr.) 283**.

6. This Court in exercise of its power under Section 528 BNSS is not required to assess the correctness of the allegations and reliability of evidence. Thus, the prayer for quashing is refused.

7. The present application lacks merit and deserves to be dismissed.

8. Dismissed accordingly, leaving it open for the applicant to recourse other remedy available to him.

(Dr. Gautam Chowdhary,J.)

October 8, 2026
Mustaqeem.

Digitally signed by :-
MOHD MUSTAQEEM KHAN
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad