

157



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

No. 1344/Admin G-II Dated 30/1/2026

Sub: Compliance of the order dated 15.11.2025 passed by this Hon'ble Court in matters Under Article 227 No. 10901 of 2025, Anuj Jindal and 2 Others Vs. State of U.P. and Another

Madam/Sir,

During the course of hearing of aforesaid case, Hon'ble Court vide order dated 15.11.2025 (pdf copy enclosed), has expressed its displeasure over non mentioning of full name by Presiding Officers below their signature in orders and judgments.

Accordingly, Hon'ble Court has directed that, while passing a specific order, wherein the rights and liabilities of the individual/ parties are affected, the learned Presiding Officers shall affix their complete/ full signature and write their names, as provided by this Court vide Circular No. 9513/Admin G-II dated 19.07.2023.

In this regard, I am directed by Hon'ble Court to send the pdf copy of the aforesaid order dated 15.11.2025 passed by Hon'ble Court to your goodself for onward circulation of the same amongst all the Judicial Officers of your judgship for their information and strict compliance.

Encl:- As above

Yours faithfully,

Manjeet Singh Sheoran
29.1.26
Registrar General

No. /Admin G-II Dated /2026

copy to The Director, Judicial Training and Research Institute, U.P., Lucknow for information.

With Regards,

Registrar General

Seen Circulate amongst all the
Judicial Officers for strict
compliance.
Put this matter on in monthly meeting
also & give update.

DJS
31/1/26



2025:AHC:204584

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
MATTERS UNDER ARTICLE 227 No. - 10901 of 2025**

Anuj Jindal And 2 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Mirza Faheem Beg
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: G.A., Vinay Kumar Singh

Court No. - 90

HON'BLE HARVIR SINGH, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned counsel for the respondent and perused the record.

2. The present petition Under Article 227 of the Constitution of India against the order dated 8.8.2025 passed by learned Special Judge (E.C.) Act / Additional Sessions Judge, Court No. 4, Saharanpur, by the said order dated 8.8.2025, the revision moved by the petitioners, bearing No. 283 of 2025 has been dismissed by learned Special Judge (E.C.) Act, Saharanpur. The said revision was moved against the order dated 11.6.2025 passed by learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Saharanpur. By the said order dated 11.6.2025, the petitioners were summoned under Sections 452, 427, 323 and 405 I.P.C.

3. It is the ground and grievance of the petitioners that, while passing the order dated 11.6.2025, the petitioners were not heard prior to issuing the summoning order, which is mandatory as per Section 223 of B.N.S.S., since the procedure adopted in the impugned order has not been followed, as per B.N.S.S., how the first information report was lodged pursuant to an order passed under Section 174(3) B.N.S.S. It is further submitted that neither the Chief Judicial Magistrate nor the



Special Judge (E.C.) Act considered the fact of affording an opportunity of being heard prior to issuing of the summoning order, as a matter of record, while the order of summon dated 11.6.2025 was passed by learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, no opportunity whatsoever was afforded to the petitioners, which is relevant under Section 223 of B.N.S.S. Section 223 of B.N.S.S. is enumerated herein below :-

"(1) A Magistrate having jurisdiction while taking cognizance of an offence on complaint shall examine upon oath the complainant and the witnesses present, if any, and the substance of such examination shall be reduced to writing and shall be signed by the complainant and the witnesses, and also by the Magistrate:

Provided that no cognizance of an offence shall be taken by the Magistrate without giving the accused an opportunity of being heard:

Provided further that when the complaint is made in writing, the

Magistrate need not examine the complainant and the witnesses—

(a) if a public servant acting or purporting to act in the discharge of his official duties or a Court has made the complaint; or

(b) if the Magistrate makes over the case for inquiry or trial to another

Magistrate under section 212:

Provided also that if the Magistrate makes over the case to another Magistrate under section 212 after examining the complainant and the witnesses, the latter Magistrate need not re-examine them.

(2) A Magistrate shall not take cognizance on a complaint against a public servant for any offence alleged to have been committed in course of the discharge of his official functions or duties unless—

(a) such public servant is given an opportunity to make assertions as to the situation that led to the incident so alleged; and

(b) a report containing facts and circumstances of the incident from the officer superior to such public servant is received."

4. In view of the above, and after perusal of the order dated 11.6.2025 and 8.8.2025, it is clear that the petitioners were not afforded the opportunity, as provided under Section 223 of B.N.S.S., hence the order dated 11.6.2025, i.e. summoning order and thereafter the order dated 8.8.2025 passed in

Criminal Revision No. 283 of 2025 are hereby quashed and set aside.

5. It is directed that prior to passing of any summoning order, the concerned Chief Judicial Magistrate shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioners as provided under Section 223 of B.N.S.S. and shall pass an order afresh thereafter.

6. Apart from the facts of the case, learned counsel for the petitioners stated that the petitioners faced difficulties in getting the certified copies of the order, if the name and detailed signature of the learned judicial officer are missing. It has also been submitted that, when the orders are uploaded and perused, then it becomes difficult to know the name of the officer by whom the order has been passed. From the perusal of the order dated 11.6.2025 passed by learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Saharanpur that at the top of the order, the name of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate is missing, at the same time, in the operating part of the order, the signatures of the learned CJM are not complete and only initials have been affixed and the name of the learned C.J.M. is also not found written there at the bottom of the order, from which, it is not clear, as to by whom (name), the said order has been passed. In this regard, a Circular letter No. 9513, dated 19.07.2023 has been issued by this Court.

From,
Rajeev Bharti, HJS
Registrar General
High Court of Judicature at, Allahaabd.

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

No. 9513 / Admin G-II Dated 19/07/2023

Sub: Mentioning of full name by Presiding Officers below their signature in orders and judgements.

Madam/Sir,

During the course of hearing Criminal Misc. Anticipatory Bail Application u/s 438 Cr.P.C. No. 1304 of 2023, Khalil Ahmad Alias Khalil Pradhan Vs. State of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Home Deptt, U.P. Lko AND 2 Others, Hon'ble Court has observed

that Presiding Officers are not mentioning their names below signature.

While enclosing a pdf copy of order dated 30.05.2023 of Hon'ble Court, I am directed to inform that Hon'ble Court has been pleased to direct that all the Presiding Officers shall mention their full name below their signature.

You, are therefore, requested to ensure strict compliance of the directions of Hon'ble Court in the aforesaid judgment, by all the concerned, under your supervision and administrative control, in letter and spirit.

With regards,

Encl:- As bove

Yours faithfully

Sd/-
18/7/23

Registrar General

7. It is needless to mention that, this Court by passing a judicial order in several petitions has directed that the Presiding Officers/Presiding Judicial Officers shall mention their name, designation and I.D. number, below their signature on the judicial orders. As directed by this Court, the Registrar General has issued several circulars directing to the Presiding Officers of the District court to mention their name, designation and I.D. number below their signature from time to time. However, in this case, the then Presiding Officer i.e. the then Chief Judicial Magistrate, Saharanpur, in the order dated 11.6.2025 has not complied the directions, as well as the circular letter issued on the directions on judicial side by this Court, and the same amounts to **contempt** of this Court.

8. Accordingly, the then Presiding Officer, who has made only initials on order dated 11.06.2025 and did not write his/her name, would have been summoned for submitting his/her **explanation**, why this matter be not referred to initiate **contempt proceedings**, as well as **departmental proceedings** would have been directed to be initiated against him/her by this Court and thereafter the consequence would have followed. However, taking a very very lenient view and considering the early career of the officer, no such action is recommended, however the learned C.J.M./Officer (who has signed) and passed the order dated 11.6.2025 is advised to remain careful in

future and shall comply with the circular letters issued from time to time.

9. Hence it is directed that, while passing a specific order, wherein the rights and liabilities of the individual / parties are affected, the learned Presiding Officers shall affix their complete / full signatures and shall write their names, as provided by this Court, vide Circular No. 9513 /Admin G-II Dated 19.07.2023.

10. If the aforesaid direction is not complied with, appropriate action as may deem fit, shall be initiated against the erring judicial officers. Hence all Judicial Officers of the State of U.P. are directed to follow and comply the circular letter issued from time to time.

11. Registrar (Compliance) of this Court is directed to ensure that, this order is communicated to the concerned Judicial Officer, the District Judges of all Districts, as well as all Judicial Officers of the State of U.P. for information and necessary compliance.

12. Accordingly, the petition under Article 227, is allowed and the order dated 8.8.2025 passed by learned Special Judge (E.C.) Act / Additional Sessions Judge, Court No. 4 and order dated 11.6.2025 passed by learned C.J.M., Saharanpur are hereby set aside. The matter is remitted to the Court of learned C.J.M., Saharanpur for passing the order afresh.

(Harvir Singh,J.)

November 15, 2025
Faridul