System Officer

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT JUDGE, PRAYAGRAJ.

ADMIN. ORDER NO. 719 **Dated : Oct.28, 2026**

ORDER

In compliance of Hon'ble High Court's directions communicated through **Circular Letter No. 16/Admin. G-II Dt. 27.10.2026** (copy enclosed) *(received through email dt. 27.10.2026, 2:27:20 PM)* regarding **Prohibition on use of "PRINTED PROFORMA" in passing Judicial Orders**, following order is being passed for ensuring strict compliance :

(i) The System Officer and the System Assistant are directed to circulate a pdf copy of Hon'ble Court's above **circular letter** along with its annexures, amongst all the Judicial Officers of the Prayagraj Judgeship for their information and necessary compliance, without any slippage.

(ii) A hard copy of Hon'ble Court's aforesaid be also circulated among all the Judicial Officers of the Prayagraj Judgeship for their information and necessary compliance, without any slippage.

Inform all concerned.

30.10.2026

(**Shesh Mani**)
District Judge
Prayagraj.

Encl. As above.

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

Circular Letter No. 16 **/Admin G-II** **Dated** 27/10/**2026**

Sub: **Regarding prohibition on use of "Printed Proforma" in passing Judicial Orders.**

Ref:- **1.** Order dated **18.03.2026**, passed by this Hon'ble Court in **Applications u/s 528 BNSS No. 8012 of 2026, Jan Mohammad And Another Vs State of U.P. and Another,**
2. Order dated **18.02.2026** passed by this Hon'ble Court in **Applications u/s 528 BNSS No 4627 of 2026, Madhav Singh V/s State of U.P. and Another**
3. Order dated **18.02.2026** passed by this Hon'ble Court in **Applications u/s 528 BNSS No. 4572 of 2026, Akash Maurya and Another Vs State of UP and Another**

Madam/Sir,

During the course of hearing of aforeaid cases, this Hon'ble Court, has expressed its serious concern over continued practice of passing Judicial Orders on '**printed proforma'** without application of judicial mind despite various judicial pronouncements and circulars issued by this Court from time to time prohibiting such practice.

In this regard, reference may also be taken from the **Circular Letter no. 28/Admin G-II dated 04.12.2021** and **letter no. 8159/Admin G-II dated 07.07.2025 (pdf copies enclosed)** whereby directions regarding prohibition on passing Judicial Orders on printed proforma were communicated to all the Judicial Officers of the State.

Accordingly, Hon'ble Court has directed all the Judicial Officers of the State for not using "Printed Proforma" in passing the Judicial Orders.

You are, therefore, requested to communicate the directions issued by Hon'ble Court to all the Judicial Officers of your judgeship for their information and strict compliance.

Encl. As above

With Regards,

Yours faithfully,

27.10.26

Registrar General

HIGH COURT AT ALLAHABAD

No. **/Admin G-II** **Dated: Allahabad** **/2026**

Copy forwarded to following for information and necessary action:

1. The **Senior Registrar**, High Court of Judicature at Allahabad, Lucknow Bench, Lucknow
2. The **Director, Judicial Training & Research Institute**, Vineet Khand, Gomtinagar, Lucknow.
3. The **Member Secretary, U.P. State Legal Services Authority**, III Floor, Jawahar Bhawan, Annexe, Lucknow.
4. All the Judicial Officers posted in the Registry in Principal Bench, Allahabad and Lucknow Bench, Lucknow
5. P.S. to all the Hon'ble Judges at Principal Bench at Allahabad and also at Lucknow Bench, Lucknow to place the same before their Lordships for kind perusal.
6. Section Officer, Admin-H, Section for compilation of guard file.

Registrar General

2026:AHC:35851

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 4572 of 2026

Akash Maurya And Another

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Indresh Kumar
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 79

HON'BLE TEJ PRATAP TIWARI, J.

1. The present application under Section 528 B.N.S.S. has been filed to quash the entire proceeding of Case No. 234 of 2024 (State vs. Akash Maurya and others), as well as cognizance order dated 24.06.2024 mention on charge sheet dated 08.03.2024 arising out of Case Crime No. 0013 of 2024, under Sections 498A, 323, 504, 506 IPC and Section 3/4 DP Act, Police Station Mahila Thana, District Basti pending in the court of Judicial Magistrate, FTC (Offence Against Women), Basti.

Factual Matrix

2. The marriage between the applicant and opposite party no. 2 was solemnized on 27.02.2022 in accordance with Hindu rites and customs. After marriage, the opposite party resided with the applicant and his family at the matrimonial home in District Prayagraj. It is stated that the marriage was performed without any demand of dowry. However, after some time, the behaviour of the opposite party allegedly changed and she frequently engaged in late-night phone calls conversation, which led to disputes. Upon being questioned, she allegedly misbehaved and extended threats of implicating the applicant and his family members in false cases, within a few months of marriage. She left the matrimonial home on her own without informing him and later refused to return, stating that she was unwilling to reside with the applicant. It is also alleged that she was involved in a relationship with another person and continued to send photographs and videos to the applicant, causing him mental harassment and distress. On 20.09.2023, the opposite party along with her family

members came to the applicant's house and, in his absence, forcibly took away jewellery and other valuable household articles, regarding which a police complaint was made. Despite efforts made by the applicant through relatives and community members to resolve the dispute amicably, the matter could not be settled. Consequently, the applicant, having suffered mental distress, has been constrained to initiate the present proceedings arising out of matrimonial discord.

Submission on Behalf of Applicant

3. Learned counsel for the applicant contended that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the present case and that no offence, as alleged, is made out against him. It is submitted that the entire prosecution story is concocted and has been set in motion on the basis of incorrect and misleading allegations. According to the learned counsel, the applicant is innocent and has no nexus with the alleged incident.

4. It is further contended that the present criminal proceedings have been initiated with a mala fide intention and ulterior motive solely to harass and pressurize the applicant. The institution of the prosecution, it is argued, is nothing but an abuse of the process of law.

5. Learned counsel also submits that the court below has taken cognizance of the alleged offences in a mechanical manner on a printed proforma without proper application of judicial mind. Such an order of cognizance, passed without due consideration of the material on record, is legally unsustainable and liable to be set aside. Relying upon the decision of this Court in **Ankit Vs. State of U.P. and another J.I.C. 2010 (1) 432**, submission of learned counsel for the applicant is that the order of cognizance being on a printed proforma is clearly without application of judicial mind and hence is liable to be quashed on this ground alone.

Submission on Behalf of State

6. Learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer made by the applicant and submitted that at this stage it cannot be said that no offence is made out against the applicant. It is contended that the allegations levelled in the FIR and the material collected during the course of investigation prima facie disclose the commission of cognizable offence against the applicant.

7. Learned A.G.A further submitted that the charge-sheet has been submitted by the Investigating Officer on the basis of credible evidence collected during investigation and, therefore, the prosecution cannot be said to be groundless at this stage.

Observation

8. Heard Sri Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate holding brief of Sri Indresh Kumar, learned counsel for the applicants, learned A.G.A for the State and perused the record.

9. At the first instance, it would be appropriate to reproduce the provisions of law under which the present criminal misc. application has been preferred i.e Section 528 BNSS - Saving of inherent powers of High Court:-

> *"Nothing in this Code shall be deemed to limit or affect the inherent powers of the High Court to make such orders as may be necessary to give effect to any order under this Code, or to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice."*

10. Upon hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the material available on record, this court finds that there is need for careful scrutiny involves appreciation of evidence and examination of surrounding circumstances, which can only be undertaken during trial, which cannot be adjudicated upon by this court under Section 528 BNSS.

11. Looking to the aspect of the powers of the Court under Section 528 BNSS, it is settled that at the stage of quashing, the Court is not required to conduct a mini trial, thus the jurisdiction under Section 528 BNSS with respect to quashing is somewhat limited as the Court has to only consider whether any sufficient material is available to produce against the applicant or not, if sufficient material is available, the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C should not be exercised. Further in the case of **Central Bureau of Investigation v. Aryan Singh and others, (2023) 18 SCC 399** this Court held that at the stage of Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., the High Court is not required to conduct a mini trial, relevant para is reproduced below:-

> *"6. From the impugned common judgment and order [Aryan Singh v. CBI, 2022 SCC OnLine P&H 4158] passed by the High Court, it appears that the High Court has dealt with the proceedings before it, as if, the High Court was conducting a mini trial and/or the High Court was considering the applications against the judgment and order passed by the learned trial court on conclusion of trial. As per the cardinal principle of law, at the stage of discharge and/or quashing of the criminal proceedings, while exercising the powers under Section 482 CrPC, the Court is not required to conduct the mini trial. The High Court in the common impugned judgment and order has observed that the charges against the accused are not proved. This is not the stage where the prosecution/investigating agency is/are required to prove the charges. The charges are required to be proved during the trial on the basis of the evidence led by the prosecution/investigating agency."*

12. As regards the order of cognizance/summoning dated 22.12.2021, a certified copy of that order is annexed as Annexure No.5 to the affidavit. From perusal of the above order, it is evident that it is in a typed proforma where "crime number, section of the offence, name of the accused and next date fixed" are filled in printed proforma which leads to the conclusion that the Magistrate had passed the order in mechanical manner without application of judicial mind.

13. Reliance to be placed on the judgment of the case **Niraj @ Banti Shahi and others versus State of UP and another, 2025 SCC OnLine All 3024.**

> *“While the contents of a rubber stamp or printed proforma may be in accordance with law, but insertion of the accused's name and statutory provisions into such pre-printed formats is unwarranted. I must regretfully observe that this practice creates a disturbing impression that the Magistrate has not even perused the case file, let alone applied judicial mind. Accordingly, all the learned Magistrates and Special Judges are hereby directed to stop use of "pre-printed rubber stamps" or "pre-typed proformas" for the purpose of taking cognizance and issuing summoning orders, with immediate effect.”*

14. In **Roshan Lal v. State of U.P., 2024 SCC OnLine All 4828**.

“18. The bone of contention as advanced by the learned counsel for the Applicant is that the impugned cognizance/summoning order having been passed on a printed proforma by merely filling the blanks cannot be taken as an order passed with the application of judicial mind and as such the same is liable to be quashed. Since the arguments have been confined by the learned counsel, to the extent of challenge to the validity of the impugned cognizance order dated 25.07.2022 on the aforesaid ground, as such, it would be apposite for this Court to decide the said issue without adverting on the merits of the case and to judge the correctness of the allegations as well as the defence of the parties. Therefore, this Court refrains itself to make any observation on the First Information Report (F.I.R.) or the charge-sheet dated 14.05.2022.

19. Suffice it to note that, time and again the very practice of passing judicial order of taking cognizance by the learned Magistrates, on a printed proforma by simply filling the blanks, has been condemned by the Hon'ble Apex Court as well as by this Court. It would not be out of place to note that although no detailed order is required to be passed at the time of taking cognizance, but the use of blank printed proforma for passing the judicial order by the Magistrate is also not acceptable being indicative of non-application of judicial mind in passing the judicial order. While passing any judicial order including the order taking cognizance on the charge-sheet, the Court is required to apply judicial mind and the order of taking cognizance cannot be passed in mechanical manner.”

15. In the case of **Fakhruddin Ahmad versus State of Uttranchal and another (2008) 17 SCC 157.**

“It is neither practicable nor desirable to precisely define as to what is meant by "taking cognizance". Nevertheless, it is well settled that before a Magistrate can be said to have taken cognizance of an offence, it is imperative that he must have taken notice of the accusations and applied his mind to the allegations made in the complaint or in the police report or the information received from a source other than a police report, as the case may be, and the material filed therewith. It needs title emphasis that it is only when the Magistrate applies his mind

and is satisfied that the allegations, if proved, would constitute an offence and decides to initiate proceedings against the alleged offender, that it can be positively stated that he has taken cognizance of the offence. Cognizance is in regard to the offence and not the offender."

16. In the case of **Ankit Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2009 (9) ADJ 778**, while relying upon a number of decisions of the Apex Court has held as under:-

"Although as held by this Court in the case of Megh Nath Guptas & Anr V State of U.P. And Anr, 2008 (62) ACC 826, in which reference has been made to the cases of Deputy Chief Controller Import and Export Vs Roshan Lal Agarwal, 2003 (4) ACC 686 (SC), UP Pollution Control Board Vs Mohan Meakins, 2000 (2) JIC 159 (SC): AIR 2000 SC 1456 and Kanti Bhadra Vs State of West Bengal, 2000 (1) JIC 751 (SC): 2000 (40) ACC 441 (SC), the Magistrate is not required to pass detailed reasoned order at the time of taking cognizance on the charge sheet, but it does not mean that order of taking cognizance can be passed by filling up the blanks on printed proforma. At the time of passing any judicial order including the order taking cognizance on the charge sheet, the Court is required to apply judicial mind and even the order of taking cognizance cannot be passed in mechanical manner. Therefore, the impugned order is liable to be quashed and the matter has to be sent back to the Court below for passing fresh order on the charge sheet after applying judicial mind."

17. In another case **Upasana Singh versus State of UP and another, 2022 SCC OnLine All 474**

"12. In the case of Abdul Rasheed v. State of U.P., 2010 (3) JIC 761 (All). The relevant observations and findings recorded in the said case are quoted below:-

"6. Whenever any police report or complaint is filed before the Magistrate, he has to apply his mind to the facts stated in the report or complaint before taking cognizance. If after applying his mind to the facts of the case, the Magistrate comes to the conclusion that there is sufficient material to proceed with the matter, he may take cognizance.

In the present case, the summoning order has been passed by affixing a ready made seal of the summoning order on a plain paper and the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate had merely entered the next date fixed in the ease in the blank portion of the ready made order. Apparently the learned Magistrate had not applied his mind to the facts of the case before passing the order dated 20.12.2018, therefore, the impugned order cannot be upheld.

7. Judicial orders cannot be allowed to be passed in a mechanical manner either by filling in blank on a printed proforma or by affixing a ready made seal etc. of the order on a plain paper. Such tendency must be deprecated and cannot be allowed to perpetuate. This reflects not only lack of application of mind to the facts of the case but is also against the settled judicial norms. Therefore, this practice must be stopped forthwith."

13. In view of the above, this Court finds and observes that the conduct of the judicial officers concerned in passing orders on printed proforma by filling up the blanks without application of judicial mind is objectionable and deserves to be deprecated.The cognizance/summoning of an accused in a criminal case is a serious matter and the order must reflect that Magistrate had applied his mind to the facts as well as law applicable thereto, whereas the impugned cognizance order was passed in mechanical manner without application of judicial mind and without satisfying himself as to which offence were prima facie being made out against the applicants on the basis of the allegations made by the complainant. the impugned cognizance order passed by the learned Magistrate is against the settled judicial norms."

18. Apart from the number of cases, there are also several circulars issued by the Hon'ble Court which are required to be complied with. For instance, Office of the District Judge, Prayagraj, Admin order no. 444 dated July 9, 2025

"The Hon'ble Court Vide Letter No. 8159/ Admin G-II/ Dated 07.07.2025 has communicated the directions issued by Hon'ble Court's

judgment dated 7.05.2025 passed in Application u/s 402 No. 16456 of 2024, Niraj @ Banti Shahi and Others Vs. State of U.P. and Another with other connected 17 Applications u's 482., whereby it is apprised that during the course of hearing of aforesaid cases, the Hon'ble Court has raised its concern that despite consistent judgments, trial courts continue to issue summoning orders mechanically and arbitrarily, often by inserting case details into pre-drafted or rubber templates, commonly refered to as "printed proforma cognizance order" and discussed the provisions of Chapter XIV of the CrPC which addresses the statutory conditions required for intiation of criminal proceedings and put particular emphasis on the legal provisions concerning 'taking cognizance of an offence'.

Thus, the Hon'ble has directed all the learned Magistrates and Special Judges to stop use of "pre-printed stamps" or "pre-typed proformas" for the purpose of taking cognizance and issuing summoning orders, with immediate effect. In this regard, in order to ensure strict compliance of directions of Hon'ble, following order is being passed:

1. All the Presiding Officers of Magisterial Courts and Special Judges of the Judgeship are directed to thoroughly go through and ensure compliance with the the aforesaid judgment dated 7.05.2025, and not to use "Printed Proforma" in passing the Judicial Orders while taking cognizance of an offence.

2. Further, in compliance of Hon'ble Court's direction all the Presiding Officers are directed to ensure strict compliance of CL No. 28/Admin G-II dated 04.12.2021, failing which stringent action shall be taken against the erring Judicial Officers.

3. The System Officer is directed to provide pdf copy of Hon'ble Court's judgment dated 7.05.2025 passed in Application u/s 482 No. 16456 of 2024, Niraj @ Banti Shahi and Others Vs. State of U.P. and Another with other con-nected 17 Applications u/s 482., along with soft copy of Hon'ble Court Letter No. 8159/ Admin G-II/ Dated 07.07.2025 to all the Judicial Officers, working under control of undersigned for ensuring strict compliance of Hon'ble Court's directions in letter &

spirit.

4. A hard-copy of Judgement dt. 17.04.2025 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in aforesaid appeals alongwith Hon'ble Court Letter No. 8157/ Admin G-11/Dated 07.07.2025, be also circulated among all the Judicial Officers working under control of undersigned, for information and ensuring strict compliance in letter & Spirit, without any slippage."

19. In series of decision of this Courts and several circulars have been issued by the High Court from time to time which are required to be strictly complied with. However, it appears that the said circulars are not being properly complied with by the Learned District Judges, which raises a matter of serious concern for this Court.

20. In view of the above, the order of cognizance/summoning order dated 24.06.2024 passed by learned Magistrate is hereby quashed and application u/s 528 BNSS is accordingly partly allowed.

21. The learned Magistrate is directed to pass fresh cognizance order after applying the judicial mind.

22. The learned Registrar General is directed to issue a circular in accordance with law to all the learned District Judges across the State of U.P. intimating them to inform all the Judicial Officer not to use "Printed Proforma" in passing the Judicial Orders in view of the observation made hereinabove.

23. A copy of this order be sent to the court concerned forthwith for compliance.

(Tej Pratap Tiwari,J.)

February 18, 2026
PS

Digitally signed by :-
POOJA SHARMA
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad

2026:AHC:35926

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 4627 of 2026

Madhav Singh

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Satendra Kumar
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 79

HON'BLE TEJ PRATAP TIWARI, J.

1. The present petition has been filled under Section 528 of B.N.S.S. has been filed to quash the impugned charge sheet no. dated 20.10.2019 (State Versus Madhav Singh) in Case Crime No. 2861 of 2019 arising out of Case Crime No. 849 of 2018, under Sections 498- A, 323, 504 I.P.C., P.S. Rasalpur, District Firozabad, pending in the court of A.C.J.M., Firozabad and its summoning order dated 09.12.2019.

Factual Matrix

2. The prosecution case is that the informant Smt. Neeraj was married to the accused Sachin @ Titu on 27.06.2010, and sufficient dowry was given at the time of marriage as per their capacity. After marriage, she resided with her husband, Sachin @ Titu, father-in-law Madhav Singh, and mother-in-law Smt. Rajesh and other in-laws, namely her brother-in-law, sister-in-law, and brother-in-law’s wife (as named in the FIR), all of whom subjected her to cruelty and harassment in connection with the demand for additional dowry. The accused persons abused, assaulted, and mentally tortured her, and despite intervention by her parental family, the harassment continued. On 18.06.2018 at about 8:00 PM, she was beaten and forcibly driven out of her matrimonial home, and her belongings were retained by the accused persons. Thereafter, she lodged a written report on 25.10.2018 at Police Station Rasoolpur, District Firozabad, upon which a case was registered under Sections 498-A, 323, and 504 IPC.

Submission on Behalf of Applicant

3. Learned Counsel for the applicant submits that the impugned proceedings are a clear abuse of the process of law, as the appellant, being the father-in law, has been falsely implicated with vague and omnibus allegations. The entire dispute is matrimonial in nature between husband and wife, and the applicant has been unnecessarily roped in only due to his relationship, which is impermissible in law.

4. Learned Counsel further submitted that there is an unexplained delay in lodging the FIR, as the alleged incident is dated 18.06.2018, whereas the FIR has been lodged on 25.10.2018. Moreover, the injury report placed on record is highly doubtful, being prepared much after the alleged incident, which creates serious doubt regarding the prosecution story. Such delay and inconsistencies clearly indicate that the allegations are concocted and an afterthought.

5. Learned Counsel submitted that the learned Magistrate has taken cognizance in a mechanical manner without the proper application of the judicial mind. The allegations made in the FIR are general and do not constitute any prima facie offence against the appellant. The appellant is a law-abiding citizen with no criminal antecedents, and continuation of proceedings would amount to misuse of criminal law. Hence, the charge sheet and entire proceedings are liable to be quashed.

Submission on Behalf of State

6. Learned AGA submitted that the FIR and material collected during the investigation clearly disclose a prima facie case against the accused persons, including the applicant. The victim has consistently stated that she was subjected to cruelty and harassment by her husband and in-laws and was ultimately beaten and driven out of her matrimonial home. These allegations, supported by witness statements, attract offences under Sections 498-A, 323 and 504 IPC.

7. Learned AGA further submitted that in matrimonial disputes, it is common for the victim to tolerate harassment for a considerable period in the hope of reconciliation, and therefore, a delay in lodging FIR cannot be treated as fatal. The delay in the present case is sufficiently explained by continuous harassment and attempts at settlement between the parties.

8. Learned AGA submitted that at the stage of quashing, the court is only required to examine whether a prima facie case exists and not to appreciate evidence in detail. The charge-sheet has been filed after due investigation, and the learned Magistrate has rightly taken cognizance. The defence raised by the applicant involves disputed questions of fact, which can only be adjudicated during trial. Hence, no interference is warranted, and the application is liable to be dismissed.

Observation

8. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned A.G.A for the State and perused the record.

9. At the first instance, it would be appropriate to reproduce the provisions of law under which the present criminal misc. application has been preferred i.e **Section 528 BNSS** - Saving of inherent powers of High Court:-

> *"Nothing in this Code shall be deemed to limit or affect the inherent powers of the High Court to make such orders as may be necessary to give effect to any order under this Code, or to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice."*

10. Upon hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the material available on record, this court finds that there is need for careful scrutiny involves appreciation of evidence and examination of surrounding circumstances, which can only be undertaken during trial, which cannot be adjudicated upon by this court under Section 528 BNSS.

11. Looking to the aspect of the powers of the Court under Section 528 BNSS, it is settled that at the stage of quashing, the Court is not required to conduct a mini trial, thus the jurisdiction under Section 528 BNSS with respect to quashing is somewhat limited as the Court has to only consider whether any sufficient material is available to produce against the applicant or not, if sufficient material is available, the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C should not be exercised. Further in the case of **Central Bureau of Investigation v. Aryan Singh and others, (2023) 18 SCC 399** this Court held that at the stage of Section 482 of the Cr. P.C.,

the High Court is not required to conduct a mini trial, relevant para is reproduced below:-

> *"6. From the impugned common judgment and order [Aryan Singh v. CBI, 2022 SCC OnLine P&H 4158] passed by the High Court, it appears that the High Court has dealt with the proceedings before it, as if, the High Court was conducting a mini trial and/or the High Court was considering the applications against the judgment and order passed by the learned trial court on conclusion of trial. As per the cardinal principle of law, at the stage of discharge and/or quashing of the criminal proceedings, while exercising the powers under Section 482 CrPC, the Court is not required to conduct the mini trial. The High Court in the common impugned judgment and order has observed that the charges against the accused are not proved. This is not the stage where the prosecution/investigating agency is/are required to prove the charges. The charges are required to be proved during the trial on the basis of the evidence led by the prosecution/investigating agency."*

12. As regards the order of cognizance/summoning dated 22.12.2021, a certified copy of that order is annexed as Annexure No.5 to the affidavit. From perusal of the above order, it is evident that it is in a typed proforma where "crime number, section of the offence, name of the accused and next date fixed" are filled in printed proforma which leads to the conclusion that the Magistrate had passed the order in mechanical manner without application of judicial mind.

13. Reliance to be placed on the judgment of the case **Niraj @ Banti Shahi and others versus State of UP and another**, 2025 SCC OnLine All 3024.

> "*While the contents of a rubber stamp or printed proforma may be in accordance with law, but insertion of the accused's name and statutory provisions into such pre-printed formats is unwarranted. I must regretfully observe that this practice creates a disturbing impression that the Magistrate has not even perused the case file, let alone applied judicial mind. Accordingly, all the learned Magistrates and Special Judges are hereby directed to stop use of "pre-printed rubber stamps" or "pre-typed proformas" for the purpose of taking cognizance and issuing summoning orders, with immediate effect.*"

14. In **Roshan Lal v. State of U.P.**, 2024 SCC OnLine All 4828.

> *"18. The bone of contention as advanced by the learned counsel for the Applicant is that the impugned cognizance/summoning order having been passed on a printed proforma by merely filling the blanks cannot be taken as an order passed with the application of judicial mind and as such the same is liable to be quashed. Since the arguments have been confined by the learned counsel, to the extent of challenge to the validity of the impugned cognizance order dated 25.07.2022 on the aforesaid ground, as such, it would be apposite for this Court to decide the said issue without adverting on the merits of the case and to judge the correctness of the allegations as well as the defence of the parties. Therefore, this Court refrains itself to make any observation on the First Information Report (F.I.R.) or the charge-sheet dated 14.05.2022.*
>
> *19. Suffice it to note that, time and again the very practice of passing judicial order of taking cognizance by the learned Magistrates, on a printed proforma by simply filling the blanks, has been condemned by the Hon'ble Apex Court as well as by this Court. It would not be out of place to note that although no detailed order is required to be passed at the time of taking cognizance, but the use of blank printed proforma for passing the judicial order by the Magistrate is also not acceptable being indicative of non-application of judicial mind in passing the judicial order. While passing any judicial order including the order taking cognizance on the charge-sheet, the Court is required to apply judicial mind and the order of taking cognizance cannot be passed in mechanical manner."*

15. In the case of **Fakhruddin Ahmad versus State of Uttranchal and another** (2008) 17 SCC 157.

> "*It is neither practicable nor desirable to precisely define as to what is meant by "taking cognizance". Nevertheless, it is well settled that before a Magistrate can be said to have taken cognizance of an offence, it is imperative that he must have taken notice of the accusations and applied his mind to the allegations made in the complaint or in the police report or the information received from a source other than a police report, as the case may be, and the material filed therewith. It needs title emphasis that it is only when the Magistrate applies his mind and is satisfied that the allegations, if proved, would constitute an offence and decides to initiate proceedings against the alleged offender, that it can be positively stated that he has taken cognizance of the offence. Cognizance is in*

regard to the offence and not the offender."

16. In the case of **Ankit Vs. State of U.P. and another**, 2009 (9) ADJ 778, while relying upon a number of decisions of the Apex Court has held as under:-

> *"Although as held by this Court in the case of Megh Nath Guptas & Anr V State of U.P. And Anr, 2008 (62) ACC 826, in which reference has been made to the cases of Deputy Chief Controller Import and Export Vs Roshan Lal Agarwal, 2003 (4) ACC 686 (SC), UP Pollution Control Board Vs Mohan Meakins, 2000 (2) JIC 159 (SC): AIR 2000 SC 1456 and Kanti Bhadra Vs State of West Bengal, 2000 (1) JIC 751 (SC): 2000 (40) ACC 441 (SC), the Magistrate is not required to pass detailed reasoned order at the time of taking cognizance on the charge sheet, but it does not mean that order of taking cognizance can be passed by filling up the blanks on printed proforma. At the time of passing any judicial order including the order taking cognizance on the charge sheet, the Court is required to apply judicial mind and even the order of taking cognizance cannot be passed in mechanical manner. Therefore, the impugned order is liable to be quashed and the matter has to be sent back to the Court below for passing fresh order on the charge sheet after applying judicial mind."*

17. In another case **Upasana Singh versus State of UP and another**, 2022 SCC OnLine All 474

> "*12. In the case of Abdul Rasheed v. State of U.P., 2010 (3) JIC 761 (All). The relevant observations and findings recorded in the said case are quoted below:-*
>
> *"6. Whenever any police report or complaint is filed before the Magistrate, he has to apply his mind to the facts stated in the report or complaint before taking cognizance. If after applying his mind to the facts of the case, the Magistrate comes to the conclusion that there is sufficient material to proceed with the matter, he may take cognizance. In the present case, the summoning order has been passed by affixing a ready made seal of the summoning order on a plain paper and the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate had merely entered the next date fixed in the ease in the blank portion of the ready made order. Apparently the learned Magistrate had not applied his mind to the facts of the case before passing the order dated 20.12.2018,*

therefore, the impugned order cannot be upheld.

7. Judicial orders cannot be allowed to be passed in a mechanical manner either by filling in blank on a printed proforma or by affixing a ready made seal etc. of the order on a plain paper. Such tendency must be deprecated and cannot be allowed to perpetuate. This reflects not only lack of application of mind to the facts of the case but is also against the settled judicial norms. Therefore, this practice must be stopped forthwith."

13. In view of the above, this Court finds and observes that the conduct of the judicial officers concerned in passing orders on printed proforma by filling up the blanks without application of judicial mind is objectionable and deserves to be deprecated. The cognizance/summoning of an accused in a criminal case is a serious matter and the order must reflect that Magistrate had applied his mind to the facts as well as law applicable thereto, whereas the impugned cognizance order was passed in mechanical manner without application of judicial mind and without satisfying himself as to which offence were prima facie being made out against the applicants on the basis of the allegations made by the complainant. the impugned cognizance order passed by the learned Magistrate is against the settled judicial norms."

18. Apart from the number of cases, there are also several circulars issued by the Hon'ble Court which are required to be complied with. For instance, Office of the District Judge, Prayagraj, Admin order no. 444 dated July 9, 2025.

"*The Hon'ble Court Vide Letter No. 8159/ Admin G-II/ Dated 07.07.2025 has communicated the directions issued by Hon'ble Court's judgment dated 7.05.2025 passed in Application u/s 402 No. 16456 of 2024, Niraj @ Banti Shahi and Others Vs. State of U.P. and Another with other connected 17 Applications u's 482., whereby it is apprised that during the course of hearing of aforesaid cases, the Hon'ble Court has raised its concern that despite consistent judgments, trial courts continue to issue summoning orders mechanically and arbitrarily, often by inserting case details into pre-drafted or rubber templates, commonly refered to as "printed proforma cognizance order" and discussed the provisions of Chapter XIV of the CrPC which addresses the statutory conditions required for intiation of criminal proceedings and put particular emphasis on the legal*

provisions concerning 'taking cognizance of an offence'.

Thus, the Hon'ble has directed all the learned Magistrates and Special Judges to stop use of "pre-printed stamps" or "pre-typed proformas" for the purpose of taking cognizance and issuing summoning orders, with immediate effect.

In this regard, in order to ensure strict compliance of directions of Hon'ble, following order is being passed:

1. All the Presiding Officers of Magisterial Courts and Special Judges of the Judgeship are directed to thoroughly go through and ensure compliance with the the aforesaid judgment dated 7.05.2025, and not to use "Printed Proforma" in passing the Judicial Orders while taking cognizance of an offence.

2. Further, in compliance of Hon'ble Court's direction all the Presiding Officers are directed to ensure strict compliance of CL No. 28/Admin G-II dated 04.12.2021, failing which stringent action shall be taken against the erring Judicial Officers.

3. The System Officer is directed to provide pdf copy of Hon'ble Court's judgment dated 7.05.2025 passed in Application u/s 482 No. 16456 of 2024, Niraj @ Banti Shahi and Others Vs. State of U.P. and Another with other connected 17 Applications u/s 482., along with soft copy of Hon'ble Court Letter No. 8159/ Admin G-II/ Dated 07.07.2025 to all the Judicial Officers, working under control of undersigned for ensuring strict compliance of Hon'ble Court's directions in letter & spirit.

4. A hard-copy of Judgement dt. 17.04.2025 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in aforesaid appeals alongwith Hon'ble Court Letter No. 8157/ Admin G-11/Dated 07.07.2025, be also circulated among all the Judicial Officers working under control of undersigned, for information and ensuring strict compliance in letter & Spirit, without any slippage."

19. In series of decision of this Courts and several circulars have been issued by the High Court from time to time which are required to be strictly complied with. However, it appears that the said circulars are not being properly complied with by the Learned District Judges, which

raises a matter of serious concern for this Court.

20. In view of the above, the order of cognizance / summoning order dated 09.12.2019 passed by learned Magistrate is hereby quashed and application u/s 528 BNSS is accordingly **partly allowed.**

21. The learned Magistrate is directed to pass fresh cognizance order after applying the judicial mind.

22. The learned Registrar General is directed to issue a circular in accordance with law to all the learned District Judges across the State of U.P. intimating them to inform all the Judicial Officer not to use “Printed Proforma” in passing the Judicial Orders in view of the observation made hereinabove.

23. A copy of this order be sent to the court concerned forthwith for compliance.

(Tej Pratap Tiwari,J.)

February 18, 2026
Manoj

Digitally signed by :-
MANOJ KUMAR YADAV
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad

2026:AHC:55325

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

APPLICATION U/S 528 BNSS No. - 8012 of 2026

Jan Mohammad And Another

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Mohd Faiz
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 79

HON'BLE TEJ PRATAP TIWARI, J.

1. The instant application under Section 528 of B.N.S.S. has been filed to quash the impugned charge sheet dated 13.11.2021 (State Versus Faizan and others) and cognizance/summoning order dated 04.04.2022 in Case Crime No. 242 of 2021, under Sections 498-A. 323, 506 I.P.C. and 3/4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, P.S. Meerganj, District-Bareilly, pending in the Court of learned Civil Judge (Junior Division), Bareilly.

Factual Matrix

2. The complainant/victim lodged a written Tahreer in this respect that the marriage of complainant was solemnized on 24.06.2020 according to Muslim rites and customs with Faizan S/o Gulam Mohammad, resident of Mohalla Sufi Tola, Kasba and Police Station Meerganj, District Bareilly with Mehar of Rs. 5786/-. In her marriage, the parents of the complainant had spent about Rs. 6.00 Lakh but the accused were not satisfied with the gift and dowry received in the marriage. The in-laws of complainant used to harass her for bringing less dowry and used to demand a car and Rs. 2.00 Lakh cash as additional dowry. On non-fulfillment of their demand of dowry her husband used to commit cruelty with her. Her brother-in-law Munazir Shahnawaz and her sister-in-law's husband Akmal had also bad eye on her and when she was alone they used to molest her. When, she complained to her mother-in-law and father-in-law regarding this, they assaulted her and threatened that if she complained regarding incident to anybody else they will divorce her and marry their son again. On 23.07.2021, at about 07:00 pm, a girl named Arshi was calling the husband of complainant to Mumbai. When she objected on it, her husband Faizan, father-in-law Gulam Mohammad, mother-in-law Afsari, brother-in-law Munazir and Shahnawaz, sister-in-law Smt. Rabiya w/o Akmal and brother-in-law Akmal beat her by legs and fists and ousted her from their house. At the time of this incident the

complainant was 8 months pregnant. She also informed her parents regarding this incident. Then, her brother Junaid and Chand Babu came to her in-laws house and tried to persuade the accused persons many times but they were adamant to their demand. They also told that without fulfilling their demand of dowry complainant will not be allowed to enter in their house. After that, complainant came to her Maika with her brother. The husband of the complainant moved to Mumbai from the date of occurrence and married to a girl named Arshi and is living with her. Initially, F.I.R. of this case was registered against 07 accused persons under Sections 498-A, 323, 354, 506 I.P.C & 3/4 D.P. Act. During investigation, on the basis of evidence collected by the Investigating Officer, no offence under Section 354 1.P.C. was found, which has been deleted from this Crime and charge-sheet has been filed under Sections 498-A, 323, 506 I.P.C. & 3/4 D.P. Act against 03 accused persons including present accused applicants.

Submission on Behalf of Applicants

3. Learned counsel for the applicants contended that the applicants have been falsely implicated in the present case and that no offence, as alleged, is made out against them. It is submitted that the entire prosecution story is concocted and has been set in motion on the basis of incorrect and misleading allegations. According to the learned counsel, the applicants are innocent and have no nexus with the alleged incident.

4. It is further contended that the present criminal proceedings have been initiated with a mala fide intention and ulterior motive solely to harass and pressurize the applicants. The institution of the prosecution, it is argued, is nothing but an abuse of the process of law.

5. Learned counsel also submits that the court below has taken cognizance of the alleged offences in a mechanical manner on a printed proforma without proper application of judicial mind. Such an order of cognizance, passed without due consideration of the material on record, is legally unsustainable and liable to be set aside. Relying upon the decision of this Court in **Ankit Vs. State of U.P. and another J.I.C. 2010 (1) 432,** submission of learned counsel for the applicants is that the order of cognizance being on a printed proforma is clearly without application of judicial mind and hence is liable to be quashed on this ground alone.

Submission on Behalf of State

6. Learned A.G.A. has opposed the prayer made by the applicants and submitted that at this stage it cannot be said that no offence is made out against the applicants. It is contended that the allegations levelled in the FIR and the material collected during the course of investigation prima facie disclose the commission of cognizable offence against the applicants.

7. Learned A.G.A further submitted that the charge-sheet has been submitted

by the Investigating Officer on the basis of credible evidence collected during investigation and, therefore, the prosecution cannot be said to be groundless at this stage.

Observation

8. Heard Sri Mohd Faiz, learned counsel for the applicants and learned A.G.A for the State.

9. At the first instance, it would be appropriate to reproduce the provisions of law under which the present criminal misc. application has been preferred i.e Section 528 BNSS - Saving of inherent powers of High Court:-

> *"Nothing in this Code shall be deemed to limit or affect the inherent powers of the High Court to make such orders as may be necessary to give effect to any order under this Code, or to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice."*

10. Upon hearing learned counsel for the parties and perusing the material available on record, this court finds that there is need for careful scrutiny involving appreciation of evidence and examination of surrounding circumstances, which can only be undertaken during trial, which cannot be adjudicated upon by this Court under Section 528 BNSS.

11. Looking to the aspect of the powers of the Court under Section 528 BNSS, it is settled that at the stage of quashing, the Court is not required to conduct a mini trial, thus the jurisdiction under Section 528 BNSS with respect to quashing is somewhat limited as the Court has to only consider whether any sufficient material is available to produce against the applicants or not, if sufficient material is available, the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C./528 BNSS should not be exercised. Further in the case of **Central Bureau of Investigation v. Aryan Singh and others, (2023) 18 SCC 399** this Court held that at the stage of Section 482 of the Cr. P.C., the High Court is not required to conduct a mini trial, relevant para is reproduced below:-

> *"6. From the impugned common judgment and order [Aryan Singh v. CBI, 2022 SCC OnLine P&H 4158] passed by the High Court, it appears that the High Court has dealt with the proceedings before it,as if, the High Court was conducting a mini trial and/or the High Court was considering the applications against the judgment and order passed by the learned trial court on conclusion of trial. As per the cardinal principle of law, at the stage of discharge and/or quashing of the criminal proceedings, while exercising the powers under Section 482 CrPC, the Court is not required to conduct the mini trial. The High Court in the common impugned judgment and order has observed that the charges against the accused are not proved. This is not the stage where the prosecution/investigating agency is/are required to prove the charges. The charges are required to be proved during the trial on the basis of the evidence led by the prosecution/investigating agency."*

12. As regards the order of cognizance/summoning dated 04.04.2024, a certified copy of that order is annexed as Annexure No.3 to the affidavit. From perusal of the above order, it is evident that it is in a typed proforma

where "crime number, section of the offence, name of the accused and next date fixed" are filled in printed proforma which leads to the conclusion that the Magistrate had passed the order in mechanical manner, without application of judicial mind.

13. Reliance to be placed on the judgment of the case of **Niraj @ Banti Shahi and others versus State of UP and another, 2025 SCC OnLine All 3024**, relevant part of which is quoted below:.

> "*While the contents of a rubber stamp or printed proforma may be in accordance with law, but insertion of the accused's name and statutory provisions into such pre-printed formats is unwarranted. I must regretfully observe that this practice creates a disturbing impression that the Magistrate has not even perused the case file, let alone applied judicial mind. Accordingly, all the learned Magistrates and Special Judges are hereby directed to stop use of "pre-printed rubber stamps" or "pre-typed proformas" for the purpose of taking cognizance and issuing summoning orders, with immediate effect."*

14. In **Roshan Lal v. State of U.P., 2024 SCC OnLine All 4828 it has been held:**

> *"18. The bone of contention as advanced by the learned counsel for the Applicant is that the impugned cognizance/summoning order having been passed on a printed proforma by merely filling the blanks cannot be taken as an order passed with the application of judicial mind and as such the same is liable to be quashed. Since the arguments have been confined by the learned counsel, to the extent of challenge to the validity of the impugned cognizance order dated 25.07.2022 on the aforesaid ground, as such, it would be apposite for this Court to decide the said issue without adverting on the merits of the case and to judge the correctness of the allegations as well as the defence of the parties. Therefore, this Court refrains itself to make any observation on the First Information Report (F.I.R.) or the charge-sheet dated 14.05.2022.*
>
> *19. Suffice it to note that, time and again the very practice of passing judicial order of taking cognizance by the learned Magistrates, on a printed proforma by simply filling the blanks, has been condemned by the Hon'ble Apex Court as well as by this Court. It would not be out of place to note that although no detailed order is required to be passed at the time of taking cognizance, but the use of blank printed proforma for passing the judicial order by the Magistrate is also not acceptable being indicative of non-application of judicial mind in passing the judicial order. While passing any judicial order including the order taking cognizance on the charge-sheet, the Court is required to apply judicial mind and the order of taking cognizance cannot be passed in mechanical manner."*

15. In the case of **Fakhruddin Ahmad versus State of Uttranchal and another (2008) 17 SCC 157** it has been held as under:

> "*It is neither practicable nor desirable to precisely define as to what is meant by "taking cognizance". Nevertheless, it is well settled that before a Magistrate can be said to have taken cognizance of an offence, it is imperative that he must have taken notice of the accusations and applied his mind to the allegations made in the complaint or in the police report or the information received from a source other than a police report, as the case may be, and the material filed therewith. It needs title emphasis that it is only when the Magistrate applies his mind and is satisfied that the allegations, if proved, would constitute an offence and decides to initiate proceedings*

> *against the alleged offender, that it can be positively stated that he has taken cognizance of the offence. Cognizance is in regard to the offence and not the offender."*

16. In the case of **Ankit Vs. State of U.P. and another, 2009 (9) ADJ 778,** while relying upon a number of decisions of the Apex Court it is held as under:-

> *"Although as held by this Court in the case of **Megh Nath Guptas & Anr V State of U.P. And Anr, 2008 (62) ACC 826**, in which reference has been made to the cases of **Deputy Chief Controller Import and Export Vs Roshan Lal Agarwal, 2003 (4) ACC 686 (SC), UP PollutionControl Board Vs Mohan Meakins, 2000 (2) JIC 159 (SC): AIR 2000 SC 1456** and **Kanti Bhadra Vs State of West Bengal, 2000 (1) JIC 751 (SC): 2000 (40) ACC 441 (SC)**, the Magistrate is not required to pass detailed reasoned order at the time of taking cognizance on the charge sheet, but it does not mean that order of taking cognizance can be passed by filling up the blanks on printed proforma. At the time of passing any judicial order including the order taking cognizance on the charge sheet, the Court is required to apply judicial mind and even the order of taking cognizance cannot be passed in mechanical manner. Therefore, the impugned order is liable to be quashed and the matter has to be sent back to the Court below for passing fresh order on the charge sheet after applying judicial mind."*

17. In another case **Upasana Singh versus State of UP and another, 2022 SCC OnLine All 474 it is held that:**

> "*12. In the case of **Abdul Rasheed v. State of U.P., 2010 (3) JIC 761 (All)**. The relevant observations and findings recorded in the said case are quoted below:-*
>
> *"6. Whenever any police report or complaint is filed before the Magistrate, he has to apply his mind to the facts stated in the report or complaint before taking cognizance. If after applying his mind to the facts of the case, the Magistrate comes to the conclusion that there is sufficient material to proceed with the matter, he may take cognizance. In the present case, the summoning order has been passed by affixing a ready made seal of the summoning order on a plain paper and the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate had merely entered the next date fixed in the ease in the blank portion of the ready made order. Apparently the learned Magistrate had not applied his mind to the facts of the case before passing the order dated 20.12.2018, therefore, the impugned order cannot be upheld.*
>
> *7. Judicial orders cannot be allowed to be passed in a mechanical manner either by filling in blank on a printed proforma or by affixing a ready made seal etc. of the order on a plain paper. Such tendency must be deprecated and cannot be allowed to perpetuate. This reflects not only lack of application of mind to the facts of the case but is also against the settled judicial norms. Therefore, this practice must be stopped forthwith."*

18. In view of the above, this Court finds and observes that the conduct of the judicial officers concerned in passing orders on printed proforma by filling up the blanks without application of judicial mind is objectionable and deserves to be deprecated. The cognizance/summoning of an accused in a criminal case is a serious matter and the order must reflect that Magistrate had applied his mind to the facts as well as law applicable thereto, whereas the impugned cognizance order was passed in mechanical manner without

application of judicial mind and without satisfying himself as to which offence was prima facie being made out against the applicants on the basis of the allegations made by the complainant. The impugned cognizance order passed by the learned Magistrate is against the settled judicial norms."

19. Apart from the number of cases, there are also several circulars issued by this Court which are required to be complied with. Even, the Office of the District Judge, Prayagraj, vide Admin order no. 444 dated July 9, 2025 has issued order to All the Presiding Officers of Magisterial Courts and Special Judges of that Judgeship to the following effect:

> *"The Hon'ble Court Vide Letter No. 8159/ Admin G-II/ Dated 07.07.2025 has communicated the directions issued by Hon'ble Court's judgment dated 7.05.2025 passed in Application u/s 402 No. 16456 of 2024, Niraj @ Banti Shahi and Others Vs. State of U.P. and Another with other connected 17 Applications u's 482., whereby it is apprised that during the course of hearing of aforesaid cases, the Hon'ble Court has raised its concern that despite consistent judgments, trial courts continue to issue summoning orders mechanically and arbitrarily, often by inserting case details into pre-drafted or rubbertemplates, commonly referred to as "printed proforma cognizance order" and discussed the provisions of Chapter XIV of the CrPC which addresses the statutory conditions required for initiation of criminal proceedings and put particular emphasis on the legal provisions concerning 'taking cognizance of an offence'. Thus, the Hon'ble has directed all the learned Magistrates and Special Judges to stop use of "pre-printed stamps" or "pre-typed proformas" for the purpose of taking cognizance and issuing summoning orders, with immediate effect. In this regard, in order to ensure strict compliance of directions of Hon'ble, following order is being passed:*
>
> *"1. All the Presiding Officers of Magisterial Courts and Special Judges of the Judgeship are directed to thoroughly go through and ensure compliance with the the aforesaid judgment dated 7.05.2025, and not to use "Printed Proforma" in passing the Judicial Orders while taking cognizance of an offence.*
>
> *2. Further, in compliance of Hon'ble Court's direction all the Presiding Officers are directed to ensure strict compliance of CL No. 28/Admin G-II dated 04.12.2021, failing which stringent action shall be taken against the erring Judicial Officers.*
>
> *3. The System Officer is directed to provide pdf copy of Hon'ble*

Court's judgment dated 7.05.2025 passed in Application u/s 482 No. 16456 of 2024, Niraj @ Banti Shahi and Others Vs. State of U.P. and Another with other con-nected 17 Applications u/s 482., along with soft copy of Hon'ble Court Letter No. 8159/ Admin G-II/ Dated 07.07.2025 to all the Judicial Officers, working under control of undersigned for ensuring strict compliance of Hon'ble Court's directions in letter & spirit.

4. A hard-copy of Judgement dt. 17.04.2025 passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in aforesaid appeals alongwith Hon'ble Court Letter No. 8157/ Admin G-11/Dated 07.07.2025, be also circulated among all the Judicial Officers working under control of undersigned, for information and ensuring strict compliance in letter & Spirit, without any slippage."

20. In series of decision of this Court and several circulars have been issued by the High Court from time to time which are required to be strictly complied with. However, it appears that the said circulars are not being properly complied with by the learned District Judges, which raises a matter of serious concern for this Court.

21. In view of the above, the order of cognizance/summoning order dated 04.04.2022 passed by learned Magistrate is, hereby, quashed and application under Section 528 BNSS is, accordingly, **partly allowed**.

22. The learned Magistrate is directed to pass fresh cognizance order after applying the judicial mind.

23. The learned Registrar General of this Court is directed to issue a circular in accordance with law to all the learned District Judges across the State of U.P. intimating them to inform all the Judicial Officers not to use "Printed Proforma" in passing the Judicial Orders in view of the observation made hereinabove.

24. A copy of this order be sent to the court concerned forthwith for compliance.

March 18, 2026
MN/-

(Tej Pratap Tiwari,J.)

Digitally signed by :-
MAHENDRA NATH
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad