



2026:AHC:117490

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL REVISION No. - 2394 of 2026

Rajesh Pandey

.....Revisionist(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Revisionist(s)	:	Pradeep Kumar Pandey
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 85

HON'BLE MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioner-Accused has filed this revision petition to challenge the impugned order dated 17.09.2025 passed by Special Judge (Gangsters Act)/Additonal District and Sessions Judge, court No.12, Ghaziabad in Special Sessions Trial No.2961 of 2023, titled *State of U.P. Vs. Jitendra and others*, arising out of Case Crime No.1375 of 2022, under Section 2/3 U.P. Gangsters and Anti Social Activities (Prevention) Act, 1986, registered at Police Station Kavi Nagar, district Ghaziabad, whereby discharge application filed by the petitioner has been rejected.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the trial court has proceeded to frame the charges against the petitioner in a mechanical manner and has not examined the gang chart properly, wherein the approval granted by District Magistrate, Ghaziabad is non-speaking. Learned counsel has relied upon the decision in ***Shabbir Husain and another Vs. State of U.P. and others, decided on 27.06.2025*** to contend that the approval by the statutory authorities under Gangsters act has to be given by application of mind, therefore, on this ground alone, the impugned order calls for interference by this Court. He prays that the impugned order be set aside and the petitioner be discharged.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and considering his submissions, this Court finds that as per gang chart, the petitioner is involved in four cases including three cases under N.D.P.S. Act and one more case under Section 420 I.P.C. The gang chart relied upon by the

prosecution is also appended as Annexure-2 and a careful examination of the same shows that the District Magistrate, Ghaziabad has granted approval after carefully analyzing the gang chart as well as material appended with it. The approval by the District Magistrate, Ghaziabad cannot be said to be non-speaking as the officer has applied his mind to the accompanying documents, therefore, it cannot be said that the approval is improper. Thus, the decision relied upon by the petitioner is not helpful. As a result this Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned order framing charges against the petitioner.

No other argument has been raised.

Resultantly, the revision fails and is hereby dismissed.

(Manoj Bajaj,J.)

May 20, 2026

R./