CNR No: PHHC010973052026
2026:PHHC:192401

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32503-2026 (O&M)
Reserved on : 17.08.2026
Pronounced on : 16.10.2026

Khokhan Hawladar

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab & Anr.

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA PARTAP SINGH

Argued by : Ms. Madhumita Bhattacharjee, Advocate and
Ms. Debarati Sadhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jatin Kundu, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. R.S. Randhawa, Sr. Advocate with
Ms. Mamta, Mr. Karanyog Singh Riar, and
Ms. Deepinder Kaur, Advocate for the respondent No.2.

*****

SURYA PARTAP SINGH, J.

This is a petition, under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, whereby the quashing of FIR No.39 dated 11.02.2026, Police Station Divison No.6, Police Commissionerate District Ludhiana, has been sought. The abovementioned FIR has been lodged for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 318(2), 351, 61(2) [Sections 336(3), 338, 340(2) added later on] of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Sections 103, 104 of Trade Marks Act, 1999.

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

2. Briefly stating the facts emerging from record are that the abovementioned FIR came into being on a complaint filed by 'Prabhjot Singh', hereinafter being referred to as 'complainant' only. In the abovementioned complaint, which served as foundation of FIR, it has been alleged that 'M/s G.K. Traders' has been carrying on business of manufacturing cycle/rickshaw and its spare parts since the year 1961, and that various registrations including sales tax, VAT, GST and trademark etc. stand in favour of the firm of the complainant. According to complainant, the accused, namely 'Khokhan Hawildar', the petitioner herein, 'Papiya Howladar', 'Parthajit Dasgupta' and 'Sandip Ghosh' are associated with the companies, namely 'M/s G.K. Rickshaw Ltd.' and 'G.K.S. Rickshaw Pvt. Ltd.', and that they have been dishonestly using the trade name/trademark "G.K." and fabricated documents, brochures and GST related records in the name of firm of complainant, i.e. 'M/s G.K. Traders'. The complainant has further alleged that the above-named accused have even applied for registration of complainant's trademark in their own favour on the strength of false documents and in the abovementioned manner, earned wrongful gain on the cost of wrongful loss to the complainant.

3. In the abovementioned complaint, the complainant has also claimed that on 27.02.2025, few of the accused visited the office of complainant at Ludhiana and threatened him to withdraw pending cases filed by the complainant against the accused, and pressurized the complainant to stop opposing the abovementioned illegal business activities of the accused.

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

The complainant has also stated that on the abovementioned occasion, he was manhandled also, by the accused.

4. In addition to above, the complainant has alleged that with regard to abovementioned dispute, even a civil suit has been filed by the petitioner, but despite a restraint order, passed by the Court in the abovementioned civil suit, in favour of complainant, the accused are continuing with sale of e-rickshaws and spare parts through dealers and social media platforms, by misusing the trade name and trademark of the complainant.

5. It is the case of the prosecution that pursuant to abovementioned complaint, formal FIR of this case has been lodged and the investigation taken up.

6. The petitioner is aggrieved of the abovementioned FIR and therefore, the present petition has been filed for quashing of the same, primarily on the ground that the dispute between the parties is a dispute of civil/commercial nature, and that for the redressal of grievance of the complainant, the complainant has already resorted to civil litigation, which is pending in the Courts at Ludhiana. According to petitioner, despite the fact that the matter is of civil nature, and the civil case is pending between the parties, on the basis of false, frivolous and baseless allegations, the FIR has been lodged.

7. It has also been alleged by the petitioner that in view of contents of the complaint, moved by the complainant, no offence against the

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

petitioner is made out, and that otherwise also, in lodging the FIR against the petitioner, the principles of law propounded by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of 'Arnesh Kumar V/s State of Bihar' 2014(8) SCR 128, have been blatantly violated. While claiming that any criminal wrong has not been committed by the petitioner, the quashing of FIR has been sought.

8. Heard.

9. It has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that present case is an example of sheer misuse of process of law, and that by twisting the facts, purely a dispute of civil nature has been given the colour of criminal case. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, in order to settle his scores, with the petitioner, and to pressurize the petitioner, to follow the dictates of the complainant, with regard to rival business entities of the complainant and the petitioner, the FIR in question has been lodged, as an arm-twisting method. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, the sole purpose of filing of FIR is to extract illegal benefit from the petitioner, who is locked in a civil battle with the complainant. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the local police has connived with the complainant, and that by adopting altogether illegal measures not only the FIR has been lodged, but also the investigation has been initiated by the police.

10. With regard to dispute between the parties, the learned counsel for the petitioner has contended that the petitioner and the complainant are the business rivals in the same field, and that with regard to misuse of

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

trademark by the petitioner, a civil suit, i.e. Civil Suit No.14/2025, titled as 'M/s G.K. Traders & Anr. V/s M/s G.K. Rickshaw Ltd. & Ors.', has already been filed. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, in the abovementioned civil suit, even an application for *ad-interim* injunction was filed by the petitioner and, thus whatever the grievance has been alleged by the complainant, the same can be effectively addressed in the abovementioned civil litigation only.

11. It has been further contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that in the abovementioned civil suit, by virtue of order dated 28.01.2025, even *ad-interim* injunction order has been passed by the learned Court, in favour of complainant and against the respondents, wherein a direction has been issued, restraining the petitioner's business entity from infringing the registered trademark of the complainant.

12. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the complainant is not satisfied with the *ad-interim* relief granted to him in civil litigation, and that with an intention to extract illegal benefits from the petitioner, by cooking up a false story the FIR in question has been lodged in connivance with Ludhiana police. The learned counsel for the petitioner has further contended that the FIR has been lodged for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 318(2), 351, 61(2) of BNS and Sections 103 & 104 of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, and that in view of law propounded by Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of 'Arnesh Kumar' (*supra*) and 'Satyendra Kumar Antil V/s CBI' (2022) 10 S.C.R. 351, a notice should

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

have been served by the police authorities upon the petitioner, but deliberately the abovementioned procedure has not been followed. It has also been pointed out by learned counsel for the petitioner that during the course of investigation, Sections 336(3), 338 and 340(2) of BNS have been added by the Investigating Agency.

13. It has also been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is wrongly being projected as a violator of law. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, in fact when the petitioner came to know about the pendency of present FIR, he approached his counsel for filing of application for anticipatory bail, but the same was not filed by the counsel, but the petitioner was under a wrong impression that it had already been filed. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, in such circumstances, on the basis of an illegal 'Look-Out Notice', the petitioner was apprehended at the 'Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose International Airport' on 08.05.2026, when he was slated to visit China for business purposes.

14. With regard to abovementioned incident of arrest of the petitioner, it has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that after arrest at the 'Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose International Airport', the petitioner was produced in the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Barrackpore, North 24 Parganas, West Bengal, on 09.05.2026, and that the abovementioned Court was gracious enough to accord transit bail to the petitioner till 12.05.2026. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, the abovementioned Court, while extending the benefit of transit

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

bail, directed the petitioner to report back to the same Court on or before 15.05.2026.

15. As per learned counsel for the petitioner, on account of fear due to abovementioned incident, the petitioner fell ill, as his blood pressure increased and therefore, he could not appear before the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class Ludhiana till 12.05.2026 and subsequently, his application for anticipatory bail was dismissed by the learned Court at Ludhiana, vis-à-vis by this Court. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, on the advice of his counsel, the petitioner has filed the present petition for quashing of FIR in question, and that the co-accused of the petitioner have already been protected by this Court, in view of the fact that the parties were ready to negotiate for amicable settlement and the dispute was referred to High Court Mediation & Conciliation Centre.

16. In addition to above, the learned counsel for the petitioner has also contended that it is necessary for the complainant to prove that there has been any kind of illegal or criminal activity on the part of petitioner, and that by twisting the facts, which give rise to a cause of action for civil dispute, the present FIR has been lodged. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, there is no specific and categorical allegation qua the fact that any document, whatsoever, has been forged by the petitioner, but the FIR has been lodged for the commission of abovementioned offence.

17. While claiming that the litigation pursuant to abovementioned FIR is nothing, but an abuse of process of law, in view of the principles of

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the cases of 'Usha Chakraborty & Anr. V/s State of West Bengal' (2023)15 SCC 135, 'Prof. R.K. Vijayasarathy & Anr. V/s Sudha Seetharam' Criminal Appeal No.238 of 2019, 'State of Haryana V/s Ch. Bhajan Lal' (1990) Supp. 3 S.C.R., 'Inder Mohan Goswami & Anr. V/s State of Uttaranchal & Ors.' (2007) 12 SCC 1 and 'Pradeep Kumar Kesarwani V/s The State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr.' 2025 (4) RCR (Criminal) 119, it has been contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the present FIR deserves to be quashed.

18. The learned counsel for the respondent No.1/State, as well as learned Senior Counsel for the respondent No.2, have controverted the abovementioned arguments. The learned Senior Counsel for the respondent No.2 has contended that instant case is the classic example of misuse of judicial processes by the petitioner, and that the petitioner, who is wanted in a criminal case and was duly arrested by Calcutta police at International Airport, is continuously misusing the concession of transit bail, accorded to him for a limited period only. According to learned Senior Counsel for the respondent No.2, instead of complying with the directions of the Court of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate Barrackpor, vide order dated 09.05.2026, whereby the transit bail was accorded to the petitioner, the petitioner is continuously absconding and filing one petition after other.

19. It has been further contended by learned Senior Counsel for the respondent No.2 that there was specific direction while releasing the petitioner on transit bail that he would have to appear before the Court of

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

Judicial Magistrate at Ludhiana by 12.05.2026, but till date, the petitioner has not appeared before that Court, and the abovementioned breach of directions of the Court is still continuing, despite the fact that the application for anticipatory bail, filed by the petitioner, has already been dismissed by the Court of Sessions, as well as this Court.

20. With regard to FIR, it has been contended by learned Senior Counsel for the respondent No.2 that the plea of the petitioner is altogether false that he has not indulged in any kind of criminal activity. With regard to above, it has been contended by learned Senior Counsel for the respondent No.2 that in the FIR itself, it has been specifically mentioned that there has been blatant violation of provisions of the Trade Marks Act, 1999, in addition of breach of injunction order, passed by the Civil Court.

21. According to learned Senior Counsel for the respondent No.2, in addition to above, the petitioner has also resorted to use of fake documents for the purpose of creating fake website in the name of the respondent No.2, and that in addition to above, an incident had also been, reported in the FIR, wherein the petitioner visited the office of the respondent No.2 and intimidated the complainant.

22. With regard to above, the learned Senior Counsel for the respondent No.2 has contended that in the present case, even if the plea taken by the petitioner, that dispute is of civil nature, is accepted on its face value, even then only the dispute with regard to misuse of trademark can be termed to be a civil wrong, but creation of a fake website, with the help of

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

forged documents and intimidation of respondent No.2, do not come within the ambit of 'civil wrong'. As per learned Senior Counsel for the respondent No.2, for the abovementioned act, only criminal remedy is available. While claiming that the petitioner, who has been behaving in a *mala fide* manner right from the very beginning and is a blatant violator of Court orders, is not entitled to claim that his prosecution by virtue of FIR in question is misuse of process of law.

23. It has been further contended by learned Senior Counsel for the respondent No.2 that otherwise also, as per settled principles of law, once on the basis of contents of the FIR, the commission of cognizable offence is made out, the quashing of FIR at preliminary stage is not permissible. In support of his abovementioned arguments, the learned Senior Counsel for the respondent No.2 has referred to the principles of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the cases of 'Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. V/s State of Maharashtra and Others' 2021 SCC OnlineSC 315, 'State of Haryana Vs. Ch. Bhajan Lal', 1991(1) RCR 383, 'Sadiq B. Hanchinmani Vs. State of Karnataka', Criminal Appeal No.4728 of 2025, 'M/s Balaji Traders Vs. The State of U.P. & Anr.' 2025(3) RCR (Criminal) 175, and 'Muskan Vs. Ishaan Khan (Sataniya)', Criminal Appeal No.4752 of 2025.

24. The record has been perused carefully.

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

25. If the factual matrix of the present case is deeply and thoroughly analyzed, it transpires that there are two components, which are relevant to arrive at a decision in the present case.

26. The first component is the allegations against the petitioner in the FIR with regard to violation of trademark. There is no denial of the fact that with regard to abovementioned violation, the civil litigation between the parties is already going on in the civil Court at Ludhiana and in the abovementioned civil suit, filed by the respondent No.2, *ad-interim* injunction order has already been passed by the Civil Court.

27. The second component involved in the present FIR is with regard to creation of forged document and use of the same. With regard to abovementioned plea, there is allegation that the petitioner created false documents, and with the help of abovementioned documents the website was created, which amounts to forgery. Since the creation of false documents does not come within the ambit of 'civil wrong', in my considered opinion, the dispute in question cannot be adjudicated upon by a Civil Court, merely on the ground that civil litigation between the parties is pending. Otherwise also, the law nowhere provides that criminal proceedings cannot be initiated for redressal of a grievance relating to forgery of the documents.

28. In addition to above, it is also relevant to mention here that in the FIR, there is also allegation that in the year 2016-2017, the petitioner and his representatives had visited the office of respondent No.2, obtained access to the products, brochures and business transactions of respondent No.2 and

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

thereafter, incorporated companies under deceptively similar names, such as ‘M/s G.K. Rickshaw Ltd.’ and subsequently, ‘M/s G.K.S. Rickshaw Pvt. Ltd.’. According to respondent No.2, the petitioner and his co-accused have forged and fabricated the documents by copying brochure trademark and trade identity of respondent No.2. It has also been alleged by the respondent No.2 that even the GST registration was attempted to be obtained on the basis of forged documents. Thus, there are specific allegations of forgery against the petitioner.

29. It is also relevant to mention here that even the request of trademark was made by the petitioner on the basis of above-discussed allegedly fake documents, but on account of objections, raised by the respondent No.2 before the trademark authorities, the petitioner was not successful in his abovementioned endeavour. The abovementioned act of the petitioner, if found to be true, would amount to use of forged documents.

30. Here it is also relevant that in the complaint, there are specific allegations that on 27.02.2025, the petitioner accompanied with an unidentified person, visited the office of respondent No.2 at Ludhiana, where he abused, assaulted and criminally intimidated the representatives of the respondent No.2 and threatened them of dire consequences, including elimination through gangsters.

31. If the abovementioned facts contained in the FIR are taken into consideration, it would transpire that the alleged act amounts to commission of offence punishable under various provisions of BNS and the

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

abovementioned acts cannot be termed to be a ‘civil wrong’, for which civil remedy is available.

32. As far as the law with regard to quashing of FIR is concerned, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ‘Usha Chakraborty’ (*supra*) has observed that ‘whether a complaint discloses a criminal offence or not depends upon the nature of the facts alleged therein. Whether essential ingredients of criminal offence are present or not has to be judged by the High Court. A complaint disclosing civil transactions may also have a criminal texture. But the High Court must see whether a dispute which is essentially of a civil nature is given a cloak of criminal offence. In such a situation, if a civil remedy is available and is, in fact, adopted, the High Court should not hesitate to quash the criminal proceedings to prevent abuse of process of the Court. Section 482 CrPC is designated to achieve the purpose of ensuring that criminal proceedings are not permitted to generate into weapon of harassment’.

33. In the case of ‘Prof. R.K. Vijayasarathy’ (*supra*), the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India has observed that ‘in the present case, the son of the appellants has instituted a civil suit for the recovery of money against the first respondent. The suit is pending. The first respondent has filed the complaint against the appellants six years after the date of the alleged transaction and nearly three years from the filing of the suit. The averments in the complaint, read on its face, do not disclose the ingredients necessary to constitute offences under the Penal Code. An attempt has been made by

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

the first respondent to cloak a civil dispute with a criminal nature despite the absence of the ingredients necessary to constitute a criminal offence. The complaint filed by the first respondent against the appellants constitutes an abuse of process of court and is liable to be quashed'.

34. In the case of 'Ch. Bhajan Lal' (*supra*), the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has observed that the FIR may be quashed where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.

35. In the present case, in view of the allegations contained in the FIR, discussed hereinbefore, the principles of law, propounded by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of 'Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd.' (*supra*), are also relevant. In the abovementioned case, the guiding principles with regard to quashing of FIR have been propounded by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The guidelines prescribed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India are:-

> "a) Police has the statutory right and duty under the relevant provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure contained in Chapter XIV of the Code to investigate into a cognizable offence;
>
> b) Courts would not thwart any investigation into the cognizable offences;

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

c) It is only in cases where no cognizable offence or offence of any kind is disclosed in the first information report that the Court will not permit an investigation to go on;

d) The power of quashing should be exercised sparingly with circumspection, as it has been observed, in the 'rarest of rare cases (not to be confused with the formation in the context of death penalty).

e) While examining an FIR/complaint, quashing of which is sought, the court cannot embark upon an enquiry as to the reliability or genuineness or otherwise of the allegations made in the FIR/complaint;

f) Criminal proceedings ought not to be scuttled at the initial stage;

g) Quashing of a complaint/FIR should be an exception rather than an ordinary rule;

h) Ordinarily, the courts are barred from usurping the jurisdiction of the police, since the two organs of the State operate in two specific spheres of activities and one ought not to tread over the other sphere;

i) The functions of the judiciary and the police are complementary, not overlapping;

j) Save in exceptional cases where non-interference would result in miscarriage of justice, the Court and the judicial process should not interfere at the stage of investigation of offences;

k) Extraordinary and inherent powers of the Court do not confer an arbitrary jurisdiction on the Court to act according to its whims or caprice;

l) The first information report is not an encyclopedia which must disclose all facts and details relating to the offence reported. Therefore, when the investigation by the police is in progress, the court should not go into the merits of the

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

allegations in the FIR. Police must be permitted to complete the investigation. It would be premature to pronounce the conclusion based on hazy facts that the complaint/FIR does not deserve to be investigated or that it amounts to abuse of process of law. After investigation, if the investigating officer finds that there is no substance in the application made by the complainant, the investigating officer may file an appropriate report/summary before the learned Magistrate which may be considered by the learned Magistrate in accordance with the known procedure;

m) The power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is very wide, but conferment of wide power requires the court to be more cautious. It casts an onerous and more diligent duty on the court;

n) However, at the same time, the court, if it thinks fit, regard being had to the parameters of quashing and the self-restraint imposed by law, more particularly the parameters laid down by this Court in the cases of R.P. Kapur and Bhajan Lal, has the jurisdiction to quash the FIR/complaint;

o) When a prayer for quashing the FIR is made by the alleged accused and the court when it exercises the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., only has to consider whether the allegations in the FIR disclose commission of a cognizable offence or not. The court is not required to consider on merits whether or not the merits of the allegations make out a cognizable offence and the court has to permit the investigating agency/police to investigate the allegations in the FIR;

p) The aforesaid parameters would be applicable and/or the aforesaid aspects are required to be considered by the High Court while passing an interim order in a quashing petition in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. and/or under

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

Article 226 of the Constitution of India. However, an interim order of stay of investigation during the pendency of the quashing petition can be passed with circumspection. Such an interim order should not require to be passed routinely, casually and/or mechanically. Normally, when the investigation is in progress and the facts are hazy and the entire evidence/material is not before the High Court, the High Court should restrain itself from passing the interim order of not to arrest or "no coercive steps to be adopted" and the accused should be relegated to apply for anticipatory bail under Section 438 Cr.P.C. before the competent court. The High Court shall not and as such is not justified in passing the order of not to arrest and/or "no coercive steps" either during the investigation or till the investigation is completed and/or till the final report/chargesheet is filed under Section 173 Cr.P.C., while dismissing/disposing of the quashing petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. and/or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India;

q) Even in a case where the High Court is prima facie of the opinion that an exceptional case is made out for grant of interim stay of further investigation, after considering the broad parameters while exercising the powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. and/or under Article 226 of the Constitution of India referred to hereinabove, the High Court has to give brief reasons why such an interim order is warranted and/or is required to be passed so that it can demonstrate the application of mind by the Court and the higher forum can consider what was weighed with the High Court while passing such an interim order.

r) Whenever an interim order is passed by the High Court of "no coercive steps to be adopted" within the aforesaid

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

parameters, the High Court must clarify what does it mean by "no coercive steps to be adopted" as the term "no coercive steps to be adopted" can be said to be too vague and/or broad which can be misunderstood and/or misapplied.

36. In addition to above, in the case of 'Ch. Bhajan Lal' (*supra*), the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India after reviewing large number of cases on the question of quashing of FIR has laid down that the FIR can be quashed in the following circumstances:-

a) Where the allegations made in the First Information Report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused.

b) Where the allegations in the First Information Report and other materials, if any, accompanying the F.I.R. do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code.

c) Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused.

d) Where the allegations made in the F.I.R. or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused.

e) Where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the concerned Act, providing efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party.

f) Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.

37. Similarly in the case of 'Sadiq B. Hanchinmani' (*supra*), the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has ruled that police investigation should be allowed to proceed unless exceptional circumstances warrant intervention. According to Hon'ble Supreme Court of India the High Court should not interfere with the investigation when allegations in FIR disclose cognizable offences.

38. In the case of 'M/s Balaji Traders' (*supra*), the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has ruled that jurisdiction of quashing of FIR should be exercised sparingly in the 'rarest of rare cases'. As per Hon'ble Supreme Court of India allegations in FIR or complaint must be taken at face value and accepted in their entirety to assess whether they disclose a cognizable offence.

39. In the case of 'Muskan' (*supra*), the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held that the Court should not conduct a mini-trial at the stage of quashing and that quashing of FIR should be an exception and exercised

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

sparingly in rarest of rare cases. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India has further held that Courts cannot embark upon an enquiry as to the reliability or genuineness of allegations made in the FIR/complaint.

40. Taking into consideration the cumulative effect of all the discussions in the foregoing paragraphs, in my considered opinion, in view of principles of law, enumerated above, the facts and circumstances of the present case fail to qualify the standard meant for quashing of FIR. Since there are very specific allegations with regard to commission of criminal offences by the petitioner, in my opinion, the principles propounded in the cases of 'Usha Chakraborty' (*supra*) and 'Prof. R.K. Vijayasarathy' (*supra*) are not applicable to the instant case. Thus, it is hereby observed that at this stage, no ground for quashing of abovementioned FIR is made out.

41. As a sequel to abovementioned observation, it is hereby observed that the petitioner has failed to establish any ground for quashing of present FIR. Thus, it is hereby held that the present petition is devoid of merit and deserves dismissal. The same is hereby ***dismissed***, accordingly.

42. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of, accordingly.

(SURYA PARTAP SINGH)
JUDGE

16.10.2026
Gaurav Thakur

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes/~~No~~
Whether Reportable Yes/~~No~~

GAURAV THAKUR
2026.10.16 16:49
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document