



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL MISC. WRIT PETITION No. - 1220 of 2026

Akshay Kumar And 5 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Sunil Chaudhary
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Ashutosh Upadhyay, G.A.

Court No. - 49

HON'BLE AJAY BHANOT, J.

HON'BLE TARUN SAXENA, J.

Order on amendment application

Heard.

The amendment application is allowed.

Necessary amendment be carried out during the course of the day.

Order on writ petition

Sri Sunil Chaudhary, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner no. 1 and petitioner no. 4 became intimate over a period of time. The couple had a consensual relationship. The F.I.R. is a result of a relationship between the parties going awry. The FIR is actuated by malafides and is being leveraged to force the petitioner to marry the victim by retrospectively criminalizing a consensual relationship.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon a judgment of the Supreme Court rendered in **Salib @ Shalu @ Salim Vs State of U.P. and others** reported at **2023 SCC Online SC 947** wherein after taking note of the tendency among unscrupulous litigants to lodge false criminal cases it was held:

"26. At this stage, we would like to observe something important.

Whenever an accused comes before the Court invoking either the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (CrPC) or 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 for wreaking vengeance, then in such circumstances the Court owes a duty to look into the FIR with care and a little more closely. We say so because once the complainant decides to proceed against the accused with an ulterior motive for wreaking personal vengeance, etc., then he would ensure that the FIR/complaint is very well drafted with all the necessary pleadings. The complainant would ensure that the averments made in the FIR/complaint are such that they disclose the necessary ingredients to constitute the alleged offence. Therefore, it will not be just 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. 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 try to read in between the lines. The Court while exercising its jurisdiction under Section 482 of the CrPC or Article 226 of the Constitution need not restrict itself only to the stage of a case but is empowered to take into account the overall circumstances leading to the initiation/registration of the case as well as the materials collected in the course of investigation. Take for instance the case on hand. Multiple FIRs have been registered over a period of time. It is in the background of such circumstances the registration of multiple FIRs assumes importance, thereby attracting the issue of wreaking vengeance out of private or personal grudge as alleged."

Matter needs consideration.

Sri Ashutosh Upadhayay, learned counsel has put in appearance on behalf of respondent no. 4.

The private respondent including the learned AGA to file counter affidavit within a period of four weeks.

List after four weeks before the appropriate Bench.

Till the next date of listing or till the filing of the police report under Section 173 Cr.P.C./193 BNSS, whichever is earlier, the arrest of the petitioner pursuant to the impugned first information report dated 20.12.2025 registered as Case Crime No. 0111 of 2025, under Sections 64, 89, 351(2), 351(3) B.N.S.

Police Station- Mahila Thana, District- Bareilly, shall remain stayed.

The petitioner is directed to cooperate in the police investigation.

The counter affidavit on behalf of the State shall also disclose whether the petitioner has been cooperating in the police investigation or not.

It is clarified that this matter shall not be treated as part heard or tied up to this Bench.

(Tarun Saxena,J.) (Ajay Bhanot,J.)

February 13, 2026

Pravin