



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD**

**CRIMINAL APPEAL No. - 3145 of 2026**

Pramod

.....Appellant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Respondent(s)

---

Counsel for Appellant(s) : Rajesh Kumar Pandey  
Counsel for Respondent(s) : G.A.

---

**Court No. - 75**

**HON'BLE SAMIT GOPAL, J.**

1. List revised.

2. Sri Pradeep Kumar Tiwari, Advocate holding brief of Sri Rajesh Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the appellant and Sri Birendra Pratap Singh, learned counsel for the State are present and have been heard.

3. Notice was issued to the opposite party no.2 vide order dated 26.03.2026. As per office report dated 22.04.2026, the report of the C.J.M. concerned has been received stating therein that notice has been served personally on the opposite party no.2.

4. Perusal of the report dated 20.04.2026 of the C.J.M. concerned it is evident that notice has been served on the opposite party no.2. The police report dated is also enclosed with the said report of the C.J.M. stating that notice has been served. It is only four days since notice has been served.

5. The perusal of the said report shows that notice has been served personally on the opposite party no.2 but no one appears on behalf of opposite party no.2.

6. However, in the interest of justice, awaiting response to the said notice, the matter is adjourned for today.

7. Let the matter be listed on 06.05.2026 as fresh.

**(Samit Gopal,J.)**

**April 23, 2026**  
M. ARIF