

Neutral Citation No. - 2024:AHC:192918

Court No. - 78

Case:- APPLICATION U/S 482 No. - 25039 of 2024

Applicant :- Raju Maurya**Opposite Party:-** State of U.P. and Another**Counsel for Applicant:-** R P Rajan**Counsel for Opposite Party:-** G.A., Ranjana Singh, Shesh Nath Singh Yadav**Hon'ble Vinod Diwakar, J.**

1. Heard Shri R.P. Rajan, learned counsel for the applicant, Shri Vibhav Anand, learned A.G.A. for the State-respondent, learned counsel for the opposite party no.2, and perused the record.
2. Shri Mohit Agarwal, Commissioner of Police, Varanasi, appeared virtually through video conferencing.
3. The present application has been preferred with the prayer to quash the impugned order dated 1.4.2024, passed in Special Session Trial No.1203 of 2021, arising out of Case Crime No. 212 of 2021, under Sections 363, 366, 368 I.P.C. read with section 16/17 of POCSO Act, registered at P.S. Chaubepur, District-Varanasi, pending trial in the court of learned Additional District and Sessions Judge/Special Judge (POCSO Act), Court No.3, Varanasi, whereby the applicant's application for release of the goods was rejected.
4. After hearing learned counsel for the applicant, on examining the seizure memo of goods attached and perusal of the impugned order, this Court vide order dated 11.11.2024 directed the Commissioner of Police, Varanasi, to appear virtually through video

conferencing and file a personal affidavit containing the day-to-day steps taken by the police to recover Awadhesh Maurya and Jyoti Yadav, who had gone missing on 10.05.2021. The relevant portion of the aforesaid order has been extracted below:

“3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is the real brother of Awadhesh Maurya, who was working as driver in the informant's firm. In the First Information Report, it is alleged that the brother of the applicant has abducted minor daughter of the complainant, and the applicant and two-three unknown persons assisted him in abduction. The younger brother of the applicant is also made a co-accused in the instant case, who is still missing along with the daughter of the complainant prior to the date of registration of FIR. Learned counsel further submits that no evidence to support the bald allegation surfaced during the investigation qua applicant. At belated stage of investigation with ulterior motives, the applicant's name has been roped in the instant case at behest of mother of the victim along with other co-accused.

4. The main accused Awadhesh Maurya- who is stated to have eloped the complainant's daughter- could not be traced by the police, and therefore, proceedings u/s 82 & 83 Cr.P.C. have been initiated, consequently, the police attached the applicant's family property, earned by the father-accused. Subsequently, the father of the applicant moved an application for release of the goods, which was partly allowed by court, and vide order dated 14.02.2022 and a loader (tempo) bearing A7L1144062 was released in favour of father of applicant. After that the applicant moved an application for release of his goods, but due to certain error, the application was not pressed, and consequently dismissed. The applicant again moved another application for release of the seized household articles, which was rejected by the trial court vide impugned order 01.04.2024.

5. On perusal of the impugned order, it is nowhere mentioned that the attached property was purchased from the earning of the co-accused Awadhesh Maurya, neither any receipt regarding purchase of the seized goods is on record. The trial court has erroneously failed to consider the fact that the applicant and his father (co-accused) are regularly joining the court proceedings, and therefore, the property (household goods) cannot be attached without satisfying itself that the seized property is earned by the absconder, and there is no proof on record to this effect. Therefore, trial court is directed to immediately after receipt a copy of this order release the entire goods seized vide seizure memo 25.12.2021 and shall ensure that the goods are in the same condition as it were at the time of seizure. The compliance report shall be forwarded to this Court on or before the next date of hearing.

6. During the course of arguments, the applicant's counsel has raised serious apprehension that his younger brother and the victim have been done to death by the complainant and his family members. Since, there is a strong whisper in the village about the honour killing of his brother and the victim by the complainant. The police has also not taken a serious step to locate the co-accused Awadhesh Maurya and the victim- Jyoti Yadav since both disappeared from the village.

7. After taking overall stock of facts-circumstances of the case, I find that the applicant's apprehension is reasonable, and therefore, the Commissioner of Police, Varanasi, is directed to file his personal affidavit containing the day-to-day steps taken by the police to locate Awadhesh Maurya and Jyoti Yadav, and shall remain present before this Court virtually through video conferencing at 10:00 a.m.”

5. In terms of the aforesaid order, learned A.G.A. handed over the personal affidavit of the commissioner of police to the Court, and the same has been taken on record. Upon examining the contents of the affidavit, the following facts have been noted;

5.1 An FIR being Case Crime No. 212 of 2021, under Sections 363, 366, 368 of the I.P.C., was lodged by Shri Shambhu Yadav at P.S. Chaubepur, District Varanasi, alleging that on 10.05.2021 the complainant's minor daughter, aged about 17 years, had been eloped with one Awadhesh Maurya, and since then, her whereabouts have remained untraceable.

5.2 After registration of the FIR, the complainant's statement was recorded on the same day by the investigating officer and possible hideouts of the accused and victim were searched on 15.05.2021. Thereafter, based on CDR analysis, the possible hideouts in Mumbai was also searched on 28.05.2021.

5.3 A team was constituted under the C.O. Pindra, Commissionerate Varanasi to locate the accused and victim. *Talash-Gashti* was also issued, and a public broadcast was also made on 26.08.2021 on Doordarshan and Akashwani.

5.4 After collecting evidence, co-accused Subhash Maurya, Akshay Maurya, and Ajit Maurya were arrested on 20.06.2021, while co-accused Surya Nath Maurya and Raju Maurya were arrested on 17.09.2021. All the accused were sent to jail.

5.5 On 18.09.2021, two police teams were reconstituted to search for the accused and the victim by the S.P. (Rural), Commissionerate Varanasi: (a) One team was formed by the local police, and (b) Another team was constituted by the Crime Branch.

5.6 Proceedings under Section 82 Cr.P.C. were initiated against accused Awadhesh Maurya on 27.09.2021, followed by proceedings under Section 83 Cr.P.C. on 09.11.2021.

5.7 The accused's location was traced to Maharashtra; however, despite all efforts, the police could not recover the victim.

5.8 From 13.05.2021 to 04.12.2024, the police documented the steps taken during the investigation in *104 case diary entries*, but no fruitful results were obtained.

6. The personal affidavit of the Commissioner of Police further reveals that upon receipt of the order passed by this Court, the Assistant Commissioner, Sarnath, Varanasi, was directed to investigate the lapses committed by the investigating officers and submit a report within ten days. Subsequently, on 05.12.2024, the Commissioner of Police reconstituted a team under the Assistant Commissioner of Police, Sarnath, comprising the In-Charge of the Surveillance Cell, the In-Charge of S.O.G., Commissionerate Varanasi, and the Investigating Officer of P.S. Chaubepur, Varanasi. The team was instructed to utilize all available resources to recover the victim.

7. As a result, the victim was successfully recovered, and the accused, Awadhesh Maurya, was arrested by the police on 07.12.2024 from Pimpalgaon, District Nashik, Maharashtra. The police obtained a transit remand from the learned Judicial Magistrate, F.C. Pimpalgaon, Niphad, District Nashik, Maharashtra. Subsequently, charges under Section 68 of the IPC and Sections 16/17 of the POCSO Act were added. The accused was later released on bail. *It has come to light that the boy and the girl got married soon after leaving their village and had been living together happily in Nashik prior to their arrest. Recently, they were blessed with a child.*

8. With regard to the direction for the release of the attached goods, the same were released by the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge/Special Judge (POCSO Act) in favour of the applicant, Raju Maurya, vide order dated 07.12.2024. The goods were released through a Supurdginama, annexed on page 29 of the personal affidavit, in compliance with the order dated 11.11.2024.

9. To summarize the background of the case, an FIR was registered alleging that a 17-year-old girl had eloped with a young boy from the same village. During the investigation, the police arrested five members of the boy's family, who were later released on bail. A chargesheet was filed against all five male and three female members of the household, who had secured anticipatory bail from the court. Additionally, the police attached the entire household goods used by the family on 25.12.2021. The list of the attached goods is outlined below:

Sr. No.	Description of Items	Quantity	Value in (Rs.)
1.	Old used bicycle	2 pieces	100
2.	Old used Cot	1 piece	80
3.	Old used table	1 piece	20

4.	Wooden plank	1 piece	15
5.	Stool	2 pieces	28
6.	One stone plate of grinder	1 piece	5
7.	Wooden bed	1 piece	75
8.	Small battery	2 pieces	40
9.	Charger	1 piece	10
10.	Big-size tin box	1 piece	50
11.	Wooden plank	2 01	80
12.	Iron drum	1 piece	15
13.	A plastic drum with 10 kg of rice	1 piece	80
14.	Kathari (bed sheet)	4 piece	16
15.	Bed sheet	1 piece	35
16.	Blanket	2 piece	8
17.	Wooden plank	2 piece	100
18.	Make-up box with stool	017	30
19.	Iron Almirah		120
20.	Mattress	02	15
21.	Old used tin box	01	
22.	Old ladies purse	01	20
23.	Old Saree	06	24
24.	Male dhoti	02	3
25.	Gamchha	03	3
26.	Suit Salwar	02	4
27.	Old Jacket	01	2
28.	Ladies old shawl	01	1
29.	Kids school dress	01	1
30.	Old leggings	01	1
31.	Old frock	02	1
32.	Half sweater	02	2
33.	Muffler	01	1
34.	Ladies muffler	01	1
35.	Stole	05	5
36.	Blouse	01	2
37.	Maxi	06	6
38.	Suit salwar	06	6
39.	Pillow	06	6
40.	Small bed kathari	10	10
41.	Small LG TV	01	150

42.	Small grinder stone	1 pair	5
43.	Tin drum with 10 kg wheat	01	25
44.	Tin drum with 10 kg rice	01	25
45.	Wooden double bed	01	25
46.	Broken plastic ataini	01	2
47.	wooden dholak	01	1
48.	Plastic tal	01	2
49.	broken small tin box	02	1
50.	Ceiling fan	01	15
51.	Grindstone hand grinder	01	2
52.	one bucket iron/steel	02	2
53.	small steel bowl	04	1
54.	Steel lota	01	1
55.	Steel glass	01	1
56.	Old used iron griddle	01	5
57.	Old used tongs	02	2
58.	Old used steel plate	01	1
59.	Small steel sieve	01	1
60.	Old used steel plate	01	1
61.	Old used broken roller	01	2
62.	Old used a small spoon	03	2
63.	Old used rope	01	1
64.	Five packets rice	150 kg	
65.	Six packets wheat	160 kg	600
66.	Two packets paddy	45 kg	320
67.	Broken iron dhai	01	5
68.	Four packets wheat	80 kg	160
69.	Old used winnowing basket	01	1
70.	A bottle of 20 ml oil	01	1
71.	An iron bottle of 50 gram turmeric without cap		2
72.	Plastic bottle of 5-gram chilli		1
73.	Plastic bottle of 50-gram salt		1
74.	A broken comb and a small mirror		2
75.	Wooden bench	01	1
76.	Wall clock	01	5
77.	Old used broom	01	2
78.	Broken hand-made fan	02	1
79.	A red colour plastic bottle of 5 litre	02	2

80.	Old used CFL bulb	05	20
81.	Broken plastic chair	02	20
82.	Iron crusher	01	450
83.	Diesel engine	01	1250
84.	Old Alfa Tempo Goods vehicle	01	15,000
85.	Old iron rod	01	750
86.	Ruined iron thrasher machine	01	35
87.	Fodder machine	01	50
88.	Old used jaggery cauldron	01	50
89.	Broken window	01	10

10. After the attachment of the goods, the father of the boy filed an application for their release. Vide order dated 14.02.2022, a loader bearing No. A7L1144062 was released in favour of the applicant, whereas the application for the release of other goods was rejected.

11. Thereafter, on 02.05.2023, the applicant filed another application for the release of the goods, submitting that none of the attached goods were purchased by the co-accused, Awadhesh Maurya, nor did any of the articles mentioned in the seizure memo belong to him. Therefore, the household goods had been attached in contravention of the law. However, the said application was withdrawn as not pressed on 19.02.2024.

12. Subsequently, a third application was filed by the applicant, reiterating that all the accused in this case, namely: **(i)** Subham Maurya, **(ii)** Akshay Maurya, **(iii)** Ajit Maurya, **(iv)** Surya Nath Maurya, **(v)** Raju Maurya, **(vi)** Savitri Devi, **(vii)** Kanchan Maurya, and **(viii)** Malti Maurya are on bail, and the goods attached by the police do not belong to the co-accused, Awadhesh Maurya. The applicant further submitted that the goods are deteriorating with each passing day and that the entire family has been facing hardship in

managing their day-to-day affairs. However, the application was rejected by the impugned order.

13. Had the police acted responsibly and conducted a free, fair, and unbiased investigation in a professional manner, the two families would not have endured the trauma they suffered. The entire family of the young boy has been virtually left to starve on the streets due to the actions of the police, who failed to consider the consequences of their decisions. The entire investigation *prima facie* appears to be a botched-up investigation for reasons best known to the investigating officers who had been part of the investigation team, time to time. The actions of the investigating officer are reminiscent of the old colonial style of policing, carried out at the dictates of their masters-the rulers of India, the British- at the cost of the rule of law and human values.

14. A brief historical overview of policing in India may provide valuable context for understanding the necessity of police reforms. The police system in colonial British India was fundamentally designed to serve the interests of the British Empire. The British colonial government established a centralized police force in India after the Revolt of 1857, formalized through the Indian Police Act of 1861.

15. It appears, based on the given facts, that the Indian police system, rooted in colonial legacies, continues to operate under an authoritarian and feudal framework, which stands in stark contrast to the principles of a community-driven model of policing. Implementing such a model requires extensive training programs and resources to equip officers with the skills necessary for community engagement, conflict resolution, and problem-solving. The lessons from this dark chapter in history serve as a reminder of the importance

of accountability, ethical governance, and the protection of civil liberties in any democratic society.

16. A fair and effective investigation is the backbone of the criminal justice system. Any act that compromises the integrity of an investigation can lead to serious procedural consequences, potentially undermining justice and eroding public confidence in law enforcement. A flawed investigation can result in either wrongful convictions or wrongful acquittals, both of which are grave miscarriages of justice. As in the present case, without determining the truth- whether it was a case of elopement or active companionship- the police charge-sheeted eight family members without ascertaining the facts from the boy against whom allegations were made regarding the elopement of a young girl. Furthermore, the police attached all movable and immovable goods present in the family's house without verifying the ownership of the property.

17. The purpose of Section 82 Cr.P.C. (corresponding to Section 84 of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023) is not to penalize an absconding person but to secure their presence. In contrast, Section 174-A of the IPC (corresponding to Section 209 of the Bhartiya Nyay Sanhita, 2023) prescribes punishment for a person who fails to appear at the specified place and time as required by a proclamation issued under sub-section (4) of Section 82 Cr.P.C. If declared a proclaimed offender, such a person may face imprisonment for up to seven years and a fine.

18. A harmonious reading of Sections 84 and 85 of the BNSS, 2023, reveals that if a court has "reason to believe" (whether based on evidence or otherwise) that a person against whom a warrant has been issued has absconded or is deliberately concealing himself to evade execution, the court may publish a written proclamation. This

proclamation requires the person to appear at a specified place and time, not less than 30 days from the date of its publication.

19. Furthermore, the court issuing a proclamation under Section 84 BNSS may, for "reasons to be recorded" in writing, order the attachment of any movable or immovable property belonging to the proclaimed person. Such an order may be passed after the court is satisfied- by affidavit or other means- that the person: (a) is about to dispose of all or part of his property, or (b) is about to remove all or part of his property from the local jurisdiction of the court. In such cases, the court may simultaneously order the attachment of the property while issuing the proclamation, provided that it follows the procedure and satisfies the requirements outlined in Sections 85(2), 85(3)(a)-(d), 85(4)(a)-(d), 85(5), and 85(6) of BNSS, 2023.

20. For Reference, **Black's Law Dictionary** defines "*belonging*" as: "*which pertains to, is connected with, or is the rightful property of a person or entity*". Similarly, **Stroud's Judicial Dictionary** defines "*belonging*" as: "*that which is the rightful property or legally attached to a person or entity, either by ownership, possession or association*". The ownership may be absolute or qualified, depending on the nature of legal eyes conferred by the statutes, contracts, or any other binding precedent or customary practices.

21. In **State Of Bihar & Anr v. J.A.C. Saldanha & Ors**,¹ the Supreme Court reiterated that an inquiry must be distinguished from investigation and trial, as each serves a different legal purpose. The "*inquiry*" means every inquiry, other than the trial conducted under BNSS, 2023 by the Magistrate or Court. Inquiry by the Magistrate or Court ensures procedural fairness and protects individuals from unwarranted prosecution. It involves a conscious and judicious

¹ 1980 SCC(CRI) 272

application of the judge's mind to assess facts and evidence and determine if legal action is warranted. The primary purpose of an inquiry is to determine whether a *prima facie* case exists against the accused, warranting a trial. A trial involves the formal adjudication of guilt or innocence, with the prosecution presenting evidence and the accused being given the opportunity for defence.

22. This Court has observed that the procedure adopted by the police, particularly in rural areas, to enforce attachment orders under Section 83 Cr.P.C. is barbaric and devoid of legal propriety. It has been noted that the police, acting lawlessly, forcibly enter villages or residential areas with a large contingent of officers, often engaging in abusive behaviour and wanton destruction. They demolish mud or brick structures, destroy huts made of chaff or mud, and seize all household belongings, both movable and immovable, without verifying ownership or purchase details.

23. In cases where an absconder resides within a joint family, the entire household's possessions are indiscriminately seized, without any effort to ascertain legal ownership. Such actions are carried out ruthlessly, in blatant contravention of legal procedures, and in violation of property rights and fundamental legal safeguards.

24. In the present case, neither was the court satisfied with the requirements of Section 83 Cr.P.C., nor did the police verify the ownership of the seized goods. Such violations by the courts and the police have become routine.

25. It is the fundamental duty of criminal courts to ensure that the police conduct a fair, impartial, and thorough investigation. The court must be *prima facie* satisfied with the evidence collected during the investigation against the accused before taking cognizance of the case. In the present matter, upon examining the list of seized goods, it is

evident that the conduct of the police reflects a blatant disregard for their duties and responsibilities. This Court is compelled to observe that the officer responsible for procuring the proclamation order and subsequently enforcing it has demonstrated a profound lack of respect for his position, as well as a complete disregard for basic human values. Such actions not only undermine the integrity of the judicial process but also erode public trust in law enforcement agencies.

26. At the same time, the court also failed to exercise its independent judicial mind in evaluating the material presented against the accused, all of whom are family members of Awadhesh Maurya. Additionally, the court overlooked the critical fact that the seized property did not belong to the alleged absconder. The entire family has been subjected to prosecution without determining whether the young girl left voluntarily or was enticed by Awadhesh Maurya, a young man from the same village. Ironically, eight family members are facing criminal prosecution based solely on the unverified assertions of the complainant and his wife, a claim that has been disproven following the recovery of the boy and girl.

27. Trial courts bear a statutory obligation to supervise actions taken in connection with the enforcement of orders passed by constitutional courts. As the first line of justice in the judicial system, magistrates and district and sessions courts play a pivotal role in safeguarding public confidence in justice. When judges fail to apply an independent judicial mind, or when the police neglect their duties, it causes irreparable damage to the rule of law and undermines public trust in the administration of justice. This Court strongly condemns both the judge's approach and the police's conduct in this case, as such lapses are a matter of grave concern for constitutional courts.

28. This Court has consistently emphasized the need to sensitize trial court judges, urging them to cultivate sharp legal acumen, a profound sense of responsibility toward their positions, and a commitment to enhancing their legal knowledge with diligence and dedication. It is imperative for judges to adopt a progressive and reformative approach, aligning with the evolving demands of justice and the expectations of a dynamic legal system. By doing so, they can ensure fairness, efficiency, and public trust in the judiciary, which is the cornerstone of a robust democratic society.

29. It is essential to underscore that the collective conscience of judges must serve as the guiding force behind their decisions. Judges must fully engage their judicial minds, demonstrating unwavering responsibility and diligence in discharging their duties. Regrettably, it has been observed that some judges resort to applying the “*rule of exception*” as a blanket approach, often to conceal a lack of confidence, efficiency, or a shallow understanding of the law. In the present case, the trial court failed to adhere to statutory provisions and legal requirements, particularly in declaring the co-accused a proclaimed offender, issuing the attachment order, and rejecting the application for the release of goods. Such lapses not only undermine the integrity of the judicial process but also erode public trust in the administration of justice. Therefore, it is crucial for judges to adopt a progressive and reformative approach, ensuring that their decisions are rooted in fairness, legality, and a deep sense of accountability.

30. There is an urgent need for both trial courts and the police to adhere to minimum legal and procedural standards while issuing and executing judicial orders. Such orders must be passed and implemented in a manner that is fair, lawful, and transparent, ensuring the protection of constitutional rights and upholding public trust in the judicial system. This is particularly crucial in matters involving (i) the

issuance of proclamations for absconding persons, **(ii)** the attachment of property, **(iii)** the identification and seizure of assets belonging to proclaimed offenders, and **(iv)** the adjudication of claims and objections related to such attachments. By ensuring strict adherence to legal principles and procedural safeguards, the judiciary and law enforcement agencies can uphold the rule of law, protect individual rights, and restore public confidence in the justice system.

31. Based upon the aforementioned deliberations, the following directions are issued:

For the Courts

31.1 At the time of issuing a written proclamation requiring a person to appear at a specified place and time, not less than 30 days from the date of publication of such proclamation, the court shall record "*reasons to believe*" in its order that the person against whom a warrant has been issued has absconded or is concealing himself to evade execution of the warrant. The order must clearly satisfy the requirements of Section 84 of the BNSS.

31.2 Before issuing an order of attachment of property, whether movable, immovable, or both, the court shall record "*reasons in writing*" affirming that the attached property "belongs" to the proclaimed person. The order must also satisfy the requirements of Section 85 of the BNSS and reflect the independent application of judicial mind by the court, explicitly noting that the attached property is owned by the proclaimed person.

31.3 If any claim or application is submitted, or an objection is raised regarding the attachment of property under Section 85 of the BNSS by a person other than the proclaimed person, asserting an interest in the property and claiming that it is not liable for

attachment, the court shall conduct a proper inquiry before the final disposal of the claim or application.

31.4 For clarity, in the present context, the term "*any property, movable or immovable, or both, 'belonging' to the proclaimed person*" refers to rightful ownership, possession, or control of the property by an individual against whom a written proclamation has been issued by the court, requiring them to appear at a specified place and time, not less than 30 days from the date of publication of such proclamation.

For the Police

31.5 The Investigating Officer shall explicitly specify the details of the property "belonging" to the absconding person in an application under Section 85 of the BNSS. The officer must also accurately and clearly document the ownership, possession, or association of the attached property in the seizure memo. If it is not possible to ascertain ownership, the benefit of the doubt shall be given to the proclaimed offender, particularly in cases involving shared households or common household items.

31.6 The execution of judicial orders shall not be excessive, coercive, or beyond the legal scope and procedure established by law. Law enforcement officers must ensure that the enforcement of attachment orders should be carried out in a fair, proportionate, and legally compliant manner, avoiding unwarranted hardship on innocent individuals.

32. In light of the facts and circumstances outlined above, it is evident that continuing the legal proceedings against the applicant and the other accused persons arising out of the impugned charge- sheet filed in Case Crime No.212 of 2021, u/s 363, 366, 368 IPC and 16/17

of the POCSO Act, P.S. Chaubepur, District Varanasi, would serve no meaningful purpose and would amount to a futile exercise. Given that the chances of conviction are bleak, and considering that accused Awadhesh Maurya and his wife have been living together- solemnised marriage and blessed with a child recently - since the alleged incident, the ends of justice would be best served by quashing the proceedings against them. Accordingly, to prevent the abuse of the process of law and to uphold the principles of fairness and justice, the proceedings against the applicant and other accused persons stand quashed.

33. As the order dated 11.11.2024 has already been complied with and the applicant has received the goods, no fresh order is required for release. Accordingly, the present application is allowed in the aforesaid terms.

34. The **Registrar (Compliance)** is directed to send a copy of this order to:

(i) The Director General of Police (D.G.P.), Uttar Pradesh, who shall, in turn, forward the order to the Police In-Charge of all Districts. The Police In-Charge of each District shall then ensure that a copy of this order is circulated to all Station House Officers (S.H.Os.) for strict compliance, reference, and record.

(ii) The D.G.P., Uttar Pradesh, shall issue a notification/Government Order (G.O.) in accordance with this order to all concerned officers/S.H.Os. and shall ensure its full compliance.

(iii) A departmental inquiry shall be initiated against all police officers involved in the investigation of the present case up until the intervention by this Court. The inquiry shall be concluded in a time-bound manner.

(iv) All District Judges shall immediately convene a meeting with all judges within their respective judgeships to ensure compliance with this order in letter and spirit. The minutes of the meeting shall be recorded and maintained for future reference and record.

35. The learned District Judges and the Director General of Police (D.G.P.), Uttar Pradesh, are directed to file their respective compliance reports within four weeks from the date of receiving a copy of this order. The reports shall be submitted through the Registrar General of this Court for Court's record.

Order Date: 10.12.2024

A.Tripathi/Shafique

Justice Vinod Diwakar