



2026:AHC:104236

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

MATTERS UNDER ARTICLE 227 No. - 4475 of 2026

Bharat Singh @ Ramharakh Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Santosh Kumar Rai, Surendra Kumar Chaubey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 73

HON'BLE VIKRAM D. CHAUHAN, J.

1. The present petition is filed by the petitioner praying for following reliefs:-

"i) Set-a-side the impugned order dated 24.7.2025 (Annexure no.1 to the petition) passed by learned Additional District & Sessions Judge, Court No.1, Mau in Criminal Revision No.30 of 2025, Peshkar (Chandilal) Vs. State of U.P. & another and impugned order dated 28.1.2025 (Annexure no.2 to the petition) passed by Chief Judicial Magistrate, Mau in Criminal Misc. Application No.392 of 2025, Bharat Singh & Ramharakh Singh Vs. Peshkar (Chandilal), under Section 173(4) B.N.S.S., Police Station Kotwali Nagar, District Mau.

ii) direct the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Mau to allow the application under Section 173(4) B.N.S.S. moved by the petitioner."

2. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the application under Section 173(4) B.N.S.S. has been rejected. The allegation is to the effect that the respondent no.2, who is Peshkar in the office of Additional District Magistrate was harassing the petitioner in respect of one case and was not showing the file. An order was prepared and the same was kept in file against the petitioner and when the petitioner applied for copy of the aforesaid order, some amount has been demanded by the respondent no.2 from the petitioner. The trial court has rejected the aforesaid application under Section 195(1)B(2) Cr.P.C. as the matter pertains to court proceedings. Against the order passed by the trial court the petitioner file

a revision, which has also been rejected by the revisional court.

3. It is to be seen that in the present case the dispute is with regard to court proceedings and the trial court as well as revisional court committed no error in passing the impugned orders.

4. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner may be permitted to approach the court concerned and bring to the notice to the concerned Presiding Officer about the incident.

5. In view of the aforesaid, the present petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to raise his grievance before the Presiding Officer of the court concerned, who may consider the same and pass appropriate orders.

(Vikram D. Chauhan,J.)

May 6, 2026
Bhaskar