



2026:AHC:34315

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL REVISION No. - 4048 of 2024

Rakesh Chandra

.....Revisionist(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Revisionist(s)	:	Rakesh Chandra
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A., Pradeep Kumar Bhardwaj

Court No. - 87

HON'BLE ABDUL SHAHID, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the revisionist, learned counsel appearing for opposite party no.2 and the learned A.G.A. for the State.
2. The present criminal revision has been preferred against the judgment and order dated 08.05.2024 passed by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Etah, in Misc. Application No. 682 of 2024 (Rakesh Chandra, Advocate vs. Anuj Kumar Sharma), whereby the application under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C., Police Station Awagarh, District Etah, has been rejected by the court below.
3. Learned counsel for the revisionist has submitted that no statement has been recorded by the Investigating Officer during the course of the investigation.
4. Per contra, learned counsel for opposite party No. 2 has contended that as a final report has already been submitted by the Investigating Officer, the revisionist has the option to file a protest petition before the competent court. It has further been contended that the application under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. was filed against the Investigating Officer and the same has rightly been rejected by the learned trial court.
5. I have considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.
6. The learned trial court has rejected the application under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. filed by the complainant/revisionist by passing a speaking and reasoned order. The learned trial court has observed that an FIR has already been lodged and, after due investigation, a final report has been submitted. If

the applicant/revisionist has any reservation, objection, or dissatisfaction with the investigation, he has the right to file a protest petition against the final report before the competent court.

7. The learned trial court has further observed that, if the applicant/revisionist has any grievance against the Investigating Officer, he is at liberty to take appropriate steps in accordance with law for disciplinary action. The efficacious and appropriate remedy available to the applicant/revisionist is to file a protest petition against the final report.

8. Upon perusal of the impugned order, it is evident that the learned trial court has passed a well-reasoned and speaking order after considering the relevant facts and circumstances of the case.

10. In view of the above, this Court finds that there is neither any illegality nor irregularity in the impugned order passed by the learned trial court warranting interference by this Court in exercise of its revisional jurisdiction.

11. Accordingly, the criminal revision, being devoid of merit, is liable to be dismissed and is hereby dismissed.

February 16, 2026
M. Tarik

(Abdul Shahid,J.)