OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT JUDGE, PRAYAGRAJ.

ADMIN. ORDER NO. 623 **Dated: September 22 ,2026**

ORDER

While enclosing herewith a pdf copy of **Judgment/Order dated 11.08.2026** passed by **Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Allahabad in Criminal Appeal No. 10745 of 2024 titled Arvind Kumar and 2 others Vs. State of U.P. & 2 Others with Criminal Appeal No. 10484 of 2024 titled Santosh Kumar Dohrey Vs. State of U.P. and 2 others,** vide Hon'ble High Court's Letter No. **12122/Admin. G-II Dated 18.09.2026,** it has been communicated that during the course of hearing of aforesaid case, Hon'ble High Court has expressed its concern over the possibility of misuse of the beneficial provisions of the **Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Rules, 1995.**

Accordingly, Hon'ble Court has issued following directions, in the matter:-

> ***"The Special Judge, SC/ST Act of every district of UP and Presiding Officer, while dealing with the proceedings under the Act, shall also remain conscious of the possibility of misuse of the beneficial provisions of the Act, Rules and the schemes framed thereunder. The Court is expected to discharge its statutory and judicial duties with due care and caution and to ensure that the beneficial provisions are extended to genuine victims in accordance with law and are not converted into a means for obtaining unwarranted financial benefits from the public exchequer. This observation shall not, however, be understood as requiring the Special Court to prejudge any claim or to deny any lawful benefit to a genuine victim."***

and instructions to communicate the aforesaid directions of Hon'ble Court to all the Judicial Officers working under supervision and Administrative control of undersigned for information and strict compliance has been provided.

II. In compliance of Hon'ble Court's above directions, following order is being passed with immediate effect:

(a) The System Officer is directed to provide a soft/pdf copy of **Order/judgment dated 11.08.2026** passed by the **Hon'ble High Court** in the aforementioned case as well as Hon'ble High Court's Letter No. **12122/Admin G-II Dated 18.09.2026** to all the Judicial Officers working under control of undersigned for information & strict compliance in letter & spirit.

(b) A hard-copy of above mentioned Order dated **11.08.2026** passed by the **Hon'ble High Court** in the aforementioned case as well as **Hon'ble High Court's Letter No. 12122/Admin G-II Dated 18.09.2026** be also circulated among all the Judicial Officers working under control of undersigned for information & strict compliance in letter & spirit.

(c) In compliance of order/judgement dated 12.08.2025 passed by Hon'ble High Court in Crl. Misc. Application u/s 528 BNSS No. 6400 of 2025 titled Smt. Bacchi Devi Vs State of UP And Another, a meeting of all Judicial Officers of the Judgeship is convened on **25.09.2026** at **4.35 PM**, in the **Meeting Hall,** situated at the II-Floor of Newly constructed 24-Court Room Building of District Court Prayagraj for discussion and deliberation regarding compliance of **order/Judgement dated 11.08.2026** passed by **Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Allahabad in Criminal Appeal No. 10745 of 2024 titled Arvind Kumar and 2 others Vs. State of U.P. & 2 Others with Criminal Appeal No. 10484 of 2024 titled Santosh Kumar Dohrey Vs. State of U.P. and 2 others.** All the Judicial Officers of the Judgeship are directed to participate in the said meeting.

Inform all concerned for strict compliance.

22/9/26

(Divaker Dwivedi)
Incharge District Judge
Prayagraj.

Dated: September 22 ,2026

Through e-mail

From,

Manjeet Singh Sheoran, HJS
Registrar General
High Court of Judicature at,
Allahabad

To,

All the District and Sessions Judges/OSD
All the Principal Judges, Family Courts
All the Presiding Officers of Commercial Courts, MACTs & LARRAs
State of Uttar Pradesh

Letter. No. 12122 **/Admin G-II** **Dated** 18/09/**2026**

Sub: Regarding Compliance of the order/ judgment dated 11.08.2026 of this Hon'ble Court passed in Criminal Appeal No. 10745 of 2024 titled Arvind Kumar and 2 others Versus State of U.P. and 2 others with Criminal Appeal No. 10484 of 2024 titled Santosh Kumar Dohrey Versus State of U.P. and 2 others.

Madam/Sir,

During the course of hearing of aforesaid case, this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 11.08.2026, has expressed its concern over the possibility of misuse of the beneficial provisions of the **Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Rules, 1995**. Accordingly, Hon'ble Court has issued following directions, in the matter:-

> ***"The Special Judge, SC/ST Act of every district of UP and Presiding officer, while dealing with proceedings under the Act, shall also remain conscious of the possibility of misuse of the beneficial provisions of the Act, Rules and the schemes framed thereunder. The Court is expected to discharge its statutory and judicial duties with due care and caution and to ensure that the beneficial provisions are extended to genuine victims in accordance with law and are not converted into a means for obtaining unwarranted financial benefits from the public exchequer. This observation shall not, however, be understood as requiring the Special Court to prejudge any claim or to deny any lawful benefit to a genuine victim."***

In this regard, I am directed by Hon'ble Court to send the pdf copy of aforesaid order dated 11.08.2026 passed by Hon'ble Court to your goodself with the request to communicate the same to all the Judicial Officers of your judgeship for their information and strict complaince.

With Regards,

Encl:- As above

Yours faithfully,

17.9.26

Registrar General

Letter. No. **/Admin G-II** **Dated** **/2026**

Copy to the Director, Judicial Training and Research Insititute, Lucknow for information.

Registrar General

2026:AHC:167807

AFR

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL APPEAL No. - 10745 of 2024

Arvind Kumar and 2 others

…..Appellant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and 2 others

…..Respondent(s)

Counsel for Appellant(s)	:	Braj Mohan Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	G.A., Shikhar Tandon

with

CRIMINAL APPEAL No. - 10484 of 2024

Santosh Kumar Dohrey

…..Appellant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and 2 others

…..Respondent(s)

Counsel for Appellant(s)	:	Braj Mohan Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	G.A., Shikhar Tandon

Court No. - 93

HON'BLE SANTOSH RAI, J.

1. Supplementary rejoinder affidavit filed today in court by learned counsel for the appellants in the leading criminal appeal is taken on record.

2. Heard Shri Braj Mohan Singh, learned counsel for the appellants and Shri Rajesh Kumar Shukla, learned A.G.A. for the State.

3. The leading appeal has been filed assailing the order dated 23.07.2024 passed by the Special Judge, S.C./S.T. Act (Prevention of Atrocities), Jhansi in Case No. 228 of 2021, arising out of Case Crime No. 567 of 2020 registered under Sections 170, 323, 504, 506 I.P.C., Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 3(2)(va) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 ("the Act") and Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, P.S.- Kotwali, District- Jhansi, whereby the learned Special Judge rejected application Paper No. 32-B moved by the appellants, namely, Arvind Kumar, Atul Raj and Santosh Kumar Dohrey under Rules 12(4) and 12(7) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Rules, 1995 ("the Rules of 1995") seeking payment of the balance 37½ per cent relief amount, i.e., Rs. 75,000/- to each of the victims.

4. The connected appeal has been preferred against the order dated 23.07.2024 passed by the Special Judge, SC/ST Act, Jhansi in Case No.322 of 2021 arising out of Case Crime No.750 of 2020 registered under Sections 323, 504 and 506 IPC, Section 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act and Section 67 of IT Act, Police Station- Sipari Bazar, District Jhansi, whereby Application No. 25-

B filed by the informant, Santosh Kumar Dohrey, for release of the balance amount of financial relief under the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Rules, 1995 was rejected.

5. Briefly stated, the investigating officer, while submitting the charge-sheets in both the cases, forwarded a proposal for grant of relief of Rs. 2,00,000/- to each victim in terms of Item No. 41 of the Schedule appended to Rule 12(4) of the Rules of 1995 to the District Social Welfare Officer, Jhansi. As per the said proposal, 25% of the relief, i.e., Rs. 50,000/-, was payable at the stage of registration of the F.I.R., a further 50%, i.e., Rs. 1,00,000/-, was payable on submission of the charge-sheet (within seven days thereof, as mandated under Rule 12(4)), and the remaining 25% was payable upon conviction by the competent court. Accordingly, at the charge-sheet stage itself, a total sum of Rs. 1,50,000/- (Rs. 1,50,000/- to each victim) had become due and payable.

6. It is the applicant's case that instead of releasing 75% of the assessed relief, i.e., Rs. 1,50,000/- to each victim, the District Social Welfare Officer, Jhansi, in abuse of his office and contrary to the letter and spirit of the Rules of 1995, restricted the payment to 37.5 per cent, i.e., Rs. 75,000/- to each victim. Despite repeated representations dated 19.01.2024, 10.02.2024 and 13.03.2024, the balance amount of Rs. 75,000/- to each victim was not released,

compelling the appellants to move application being Paper No. 32-B and application being Paper No.25-B in the connected matter before the Special Judge under Rules 12(4) and 12(7) of the Rules of 1995.

7. By the impugned order dated 23.07.2024, the learned Special Judge, while noticing the report of the District Social Welfare Officer dated 04.06.2024, to the effect that the District Level Committee had, having regard to the nature of the occurrence, itself assessed the admissible relief at Rs. 1,00,000/- (and not Rs. 2,00,000/- as originally proposed), of which 75%, i.e., Rs. 75,000/-, was payable and had in fact been paid to each victim, proceeded to hold that it would not be just and proper for the Court to determine the nature of the offence or to fix/enhance the quantum of financial assistance, and that a direction to the District Level Committee in that regard would not be in accordance with law. Both the applications being Paper No.32-B and 25-B were accordingly rejected.

8. Learned counsel for the appellants submits that the learned Special Judge fundamentally misdirected himself in law inasmuch as Rule 12(7) of the Rules of 1995 expressly and specifically confers jurisdiction upon the Special Court/Exclusive Special Court to satisfy itself, on a report forwarded by the District Magistrate, Sub-Divisional Magistrate or Superintendent of Police, as to

whether relief has been paid or disbursed to the victim or his/her dependent within the time specified, or whether the relief or compensation is adequate, or whether only a part of the relief or compensation has been paid, and, upon being so satisfied, to direct payment of the balance amount, whether in whole or in part. It is submitted that far from lacking such power, the said power is textually and specifically vested in the Special Court by the Rules themselves, and the trial court erred in construing Rule 12(7) as ousting rather than conferring jurisdiction.

9. It is further submitted that the offences in the present case squarely fall under Section 3(1)(r) and 3(1)(s) as well as Section 3(2)(va) of the Act, which correspond, respectively, to Serial Nos. 18 and 19 (relief of Rs. 1,00,000/-) and Serial No. 41 (relief of Rs. 2,00,000/-) of the Schedule to Rule 12(4) of the Rules of 1995, and that it was incumbent upon the District Level Committee, and thereafter upon the Special Court under Rule 12(7), to determine the entitlement of the victims strictly in conformity with the said Schedule and the applicable Government Orders, and not to unilaterally re-assess or scale down the quantum without recording cogent reasons consistent with the statutory Schedule.

10. Learned A.G.A., upon instructions and on the strength of the counter affidavit filed on behalf of the State, does not seriously dispute the statutory scheme of Rule 12(7) as canvassed above.

However, it is brought to the notice of this Court, and duly reflected in the counter affidavit along with supporting records, that the applicant, Santosh Kumar Dohrey Advocate, along with his family members, have, till date, received a cumulative sum of Rs. 23,36,250/- (Rupees twenty-three lakh thirty-six thousand two hundred fifty only) by way of relief/financial assistance under the Rules of 1995 and connected schemes, in various criminal cases registered from time to time. It is further submitted that approximately 10 to 12 criminal cases, said to have been lodged by the appellant Santosh Kumar Dohrey and/or members of his family, are presently pending before the concerned District Level Committee for grant/disbursal of further relief amounts.

11. Learned A.G.A. submits that while the entitlement of a genuine victim under the beneficial scheme of the Act and the Rules of 1995 cannot be and is not disputed, the recurring and substantial receipt of relief amounts by the appellant Santosh Kumar Dohrey and his family across a large number of criminal cases raises a legitimate apprehension of possible misuse of the benevolent scheme framed for the protection and rehabilitation of genuine victims of atrocities, and that the matter warrants a fair, fact-based enquiry by the competent administrative authorities.

12. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having perused the record, including the order dated 23.07.2024, the report

of the District Social Welfare Officer, and the material annexed with the counter affidavit, this Court finds substance in the submission urged on behalf of the applicant that the impugned order proceeds on an erroneous premise.

13. Rules 12(4) and 12(7) read as under:

> *"12. Measures to be taken by the District Administration.-*
>
> *(4) The District Magistrate or the Sub-Divisional Magistrate or any other Executive Magistrate shall make necessary administrative and other arrangements and provide relief in cash or in kind or both within seven days to the victims of atrocity, their family members and dependents according to the scale as provided in Annexure-I read with Annexure-II of the Schedule annexed to these rules and such immediate relief shall also include food, water, clothing, shelter, medical aid, transport facilities and other essential items.*
>
> *(7) A report of the relief and rehabilitation facilities provided to the victims shall also be forwarded to the [Special Court or Exclusive Special Court] by the District Magistrate or the Sub-Divisional Magistrate or the Executive Magistrate of Superintendent of Police. In case the [Special Court or Exclusive Special Court] is satisfied that the payment of relief was not made to the victim or his/her dependent in time or the amount of relief or compensation was not sufficient or only a part of payment of relief or compensation was made it may order for making in full or part the payment of relief or any other kind of assistance."*

14. The norms of relief amount is extracted below for ready reference:

Sl. No.	Name of the Offence	Minimum amount of relief
(1)	(2)	(3)
18.	Intentional insult or intimidation to humiliate in any place within public	**One lakh rupees** to the victim. Payment to be made as follows:

	view [section 3(1)(r) of the Act]	(i) 25 per cent. at First Information Report (FIR) stage; (ii) 50 per cent. when the charge sheet is sent to the court; (iii) 25 per cent. when the accused are convicted by the lower court.
19.	Abusing by caste name in any place within public view [section 3(1)(s) of the Act]	
41.	Committing offences under the Indian Penal Code (45 of 1860) specified in the Schedule to the Act punishable with such punishment as specified under the Indian Penal Code for such offences [Section 3(2)(va) read with the Schedule to the Act]	**Two lakh rupees** to the victim and or his dependents. The amount would vary if specifically otherwise provided in this Schedule. Payment to be made as follows: (i) 25 per cent. at First Information Report (FIR) stage; (ii) 50 per cent. when the charge sheet is sent to the court; (iii) 25 per cent. when the accused are convicted by the lower court;

15. In the leading appeal, charge sheet has been submitted under Sections 323, 504, 506 and 170 IPC, Section 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act and Section 67 of the IT Act and cognizance has been taken under the same Sections and in the connected appeal, charge sheet has been submitted under Sections 323, 504, 506 IPC, Section 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 3(2)(va) of SC/ST Act and Section 67 of the IT Act and cognizance has been taken under the same Sections.

16. Thus, Rule 12(7) of the Rules of 1995 reads, in relevant part, that the District Magistrate or the Sub-Divisional Magistrate or the Superintendent of Police shall furnish a report as regards relief and rehabilitation facilities provided to the victims of atrocity to the Special Court or the Exclusive Special Court, and if the Special Court or the Exclusive Special Court is satisfied that (i) the payment of relief has not been made within the time specified, or (ii) the

relief or compensation was not adequate, or (iii) only part payment of the relief or compensation has been made, it may direct for full or part payment of the relief or any other assistance. On a plain reading, the provision is not merely enabling but is couched in terms that contemplate active judicial scrutiny by the Special Court of the adequacy and timeliness of relief disbursed. The Special Court is thus not a passive recipient of the administrative report. It is the statutory authority entrusted with satisfying itself, upon the material placed before it, whether the relief paid meets the standard prescribed under the Schedule to Rule 12(4) read with the applicable Government Orders, and, where it is not so satisfied, to issue appropriate directions for payment of the balance amount.

17. The learned Special Judge, in the impugned order, appears to have proceeded on the footing that any exercise of determining the nature of the offence or the quantum of assistance, or any direction to the District Level Committee, would be impermissible and not sanctioned by law. This approach, with respect, does not correctly appreciate the text and purpose of Rule 12(7), which was specifically engrafted into the scheme of the Rules of 1995 to provide a judicial check against under-payment, delayed payment or arbitrary curtailment of statutory relief by the administrative authorities. The impugned order, being founded on a

misconstruction of the Special Court's own jurisdiction under Rule 12(7), cannot be sustained.

18. At the same time, this Court cannot be oblivious to the disclosure made by the State, duly supported by the record annexed with the counter affidavit, *that the applicant and his family members have, over a period of time and across multiple criminal cases, received relief amounting to Rs. 23,36,250/-, with a further 10 to 12 cases stated to be pending before the concerned Committee*. The above facts have not been denied by the appellants before this court. The scheme of relief and rehabilitation under the Act and the Rules of 1995 is a benevolent and protective measure intended for genuine victims of caste-based atrocities, and its integrity must be zealously safeguarded. Recurrent registration of criminal cases followed by claims for relief, without more, does not by itself establish misuse; nonetheless, the scale and frequency disclosed in the present proceedings are such that they cannot be left unexamined, lest the object of the beneficent legislation be defeated by its exploitation.

19. This Court is accordingly of the view that while the victims in the present case are not to be non-suited or kept out of the relief to which they are found entitled upon a proper application of the Schedule to Rule 12(4) and Rule 12(7), it is equally necessary, in the interest of the integrity of the scheme itself, that the pattern of

repeated claims by the applicant and his family be independently and fairly verified by the appropriate administrative authorities, so that genuine victims are not denied timely relief on one hand, and the scheme is not permitted to be misused on the other.

20. Simultaneously, having regard to the disclosure made in the counter affidavit that the applicant and his family members have received an aggregate sum of Rs. 23,36,250/- across various criminal cases, and that 10 to 12 further cases are pending before the Committee, the District Magistrate, Jhansi, in coordination with the Senior Superintendent of Police, Jhansi, is directed to cause a thorough, fair and time-bound enquiry, to be completed within ‘three months’ from the date of production of a certified copy of this order, into the antecedents of the criminal cases registered by the appellant Santosh Kumar Dohrey (Advocate) and his family members and the relief amounts received/claimed therein, so as to ascertain whether the benevolent provisions of the Act and the Rules of 1995 have been misused.

21. It is made clear that nothing stated hereinabove shall be construed as a finding on the merits of the appellant Santosh Kumar Dohrey’s (Advocate) or the victims' entitlement to relief, which shall be determined independently by the District Level Committee. Equally, this order shall not come in the way of the enquiry directed above, which shall proceed strictly on its own merits.

22. In case the enquiry referred to above discloses misuse of the provisions of the Act and the Rules of 1995 by the appellant Santosh Kumar Dohrey or any member of his family, or by any officer or authority responsible for processing or sanctioning such claims, appropriate action, including at a higher administrative level, shall be taken by the State of Uttar Pradesh, in accordance with law, against all persons found responsible.

23. The beneficial provisions of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, the Rules of 1995 and the various Government Orders and schemes framed thereunder are intended to provide immediate relief, rehabilitation and financial assistance to genuine victims of atrocities. Such beneficial provisions cannot, however, be permitted to be misused for obtaining financial benefits from the State exchequer by repeatedly setting the criminal law in motion. In the present case, it appears from the material placed before the Court that the appellant Santosh Kumar Dohrey and his family members have received an aggregate amount of about Rs.23,36,250/- from the State fund in connection with different criminal cases, while approximately 10 to 12 matters are stated to be pending before the District Welfare Committee Jhansi for consideration of further benefits. The facts, therefore, call for serious consideration by the competent authorities. The Government of Uttar Pradesh is accordingly

directed to undertake a broad-based and intensive enquiry throughout the State and to develop the **'Effective regulatory mechanism and supervisory system'** in every district into the manner in which the benefits under the SC/ST Act, the Rules of 1995 and the Government Orders/schemes framed thereunder are being claimed and disbursed, particularly in cases involving repeated claims by the same persons or their family members. The enquiry shall also examine whether adequate verification and scrutiny are being undertaken before release of public funds, and appropriate corrective measures shall be taken wherever misuse is found.

24. The Special Judge, SC/ST Act of every district of UP and Presiding officer, while dealing with proceedings under the Act, shall also remain conscious of the possibility of misuse of the beneficial provisions of the Act, Rules and the schemes framed thereunder. The Court is expected to discharge its statutory and judicial duties with due care and caution and to ensure that the beneficial provisions are extended to genuine victims in accordance with law and are not converted into a means for obtaining unwarranted financial benefits from the public exchequer. This observation shall not, however, be understood as requiring the Special Court to prejudge any claim or to deny any lawful benefit to a genuine victim.

25. Thus, having regard to the fact that cognisance has been taken by the learned Special Judge, SC/ST Act, for the offences punishable under Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 3(2)(va) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, along with Sections 323, 504, 506 and 170 IPC and Section 67 of the Information Technology Act in the leading appeal and under Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) and 3(2)(va) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, along with Sections 323, 504 and 506 IPC and Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, and the offences in both cases, so alleged appear to attract different entries, namely Sl. Nos. 18, 19 and 41 of the Schedule referred to in Rule 12(4) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Rules, 1995, resulting in a dispute as to whether the victim is entitled to compensation of Rs.1,00,000/- or Rs.2,00,000/-, this Court considers it appropriate that the matter be determined strictly in accordance with the applicable statutory provision and the corresponding entry of the Schedule. The learned Special Judge, SC/ST Act, shall, in terms of Rule 12(7) of the Rules, examine the nature and ingredients of each offence of which cognisance has been taken and record a clear finding as to the entry which is actually attracted to the facts of the case. The said exercise shall not be undertaken mechanically merely on the basis of the sections

mentioned in the charge-sheet, but after considering the substance of the allegations and the ingredients of the offences. Accordingly, the learned Special Judge, SC/ST Act, shall place the matter before the concerned District Welfare Committee, which shall reconsider the question of quantum of compensation in the light of the finding recorded by the learned Special Judge and the provisions of Rule 12(4) read with Rule 12(7) of the Rules, 1995. The District Welfare Committee shall specifically determine, by a reasoned and speaking order, whether, on the facts and offences involved in the both cases, the applicable compensation is Rs.1,00,000/- or Rs.2,00,000/-, with reference to Sl. Nos. 18, 19 and 41 of the relevant Schedule. If more than one entry is claimed to be applicable, the Committee shall clearly state the legal basis for accepting or rejecting each such claim and shall not grant or deny the higher amount merely on the basis of the number of sections mentioned in the charge-sheet. The decision shall be taken expeditiously and communicated to all concerned, in accordance with law.

26. It is further observed that Rule 12(7) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Rules, 1995 casts a specific obligation upon the concerned District Administration to ensure that the requisite report is duly forwarded to the Special Court/Exclusive Special Court dealing with offences under the SC/ST Act. The said provision is intended to facilitate

effective monitoring of the investigation, prosecution, relief and rehabilitation of the victim and to ensure that the statutory benefits are extended in accordance with law. The concerned authorities of the every District of the state of UP shall, therefore, strictly comply with the mandate of Rule 12(7) and ensure that the prescribed report, containing all relevant particulars, is prepared and forwarded to the concerned Special Judge, SC/ST Act, within the prescribed time. Such compliance shall be duly recorded at the district level, and any deviation or omission in this regard shall be viewed seriously by the competent authority.

27. Thus, for the reasons recorded above in both the criminal cases, the order dated 23.07.2024 passed by the Special Judge, S.C./S.T. Act (Prevention of Atrocities), Jhansi in Case No. 228 of 2021 rejecting application being Paper No. 32-B and in Case No.322 of 2021 rejecting application being Paper No.25-B, are hereby **set aside**.

28. The matter is remitted to the learned Special Judge, S.C./S.T. Act (Prevention of Atrocities), Jhansi, to decide application being Paper No. 32-B and application being Paper No.25-B 'afresh', strictly in accordance with law and in light of the observations made hereinabove, within six weeks from receipt of copy of this judgment.

29. Accordingly, Criminal Appeal Nos.10745 of 2024 and 10484 of 2024 are hereby **disposed of**.

30. The Registrar general of this Court shall transmit/circulate a copy of this judgment within ten days for information and necessary compliance to:-

(i) the District & Sessions Judge, District Magistrate, SSP/SP, Police Commissioner and Special Judge SC/ST Act of UP of all the districts of Uttar Pradesh;

(ii) the Chief Secretary, Government of Uttar Pradesh;

(iii) the Principal Secretary, Home Department, Government of Uttar Pradesh; and

(iv) the Principal Secretary, Law/Justice Department, Government of Uttar Pradesh.

(Santosh Rai,J.)

August 11, 2026
Ankit.

Digitally signed by :-
ANKIT VISHWAKARMA
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad