



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 682 of 2026

Saksham Singh (Advocate)

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Addl. Chief Secy. Deptt. Of
Home Govt. Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: In Person
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C., Subhash Chandra Pandey

Court No. - 1

**HON'BLE RAJAN ROY, J.
HON'BLE MANJIVE SHUKLA, J.**

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. Let the Bar Council of India through its Secretary, New Delhi and U.P. Bar Council through its Secretary, Prayagraj be impleaded as parties in the instant petition. Necessary amendment in the memo of petition be carried out during the course of the day.
3. This is a public interest litigation, which has been taken up today on an urgent basis along with other similar matters involving advocates, which were listed today.
4. In paragraph 10, it has been averred by the petitioner, who is a practising advocate of this High Court at Lucknow, that in the evening of 07.07.2026, video clips circulated on social media, whereby some goons dressed in the attire of lawyers entered a premises and started abusing the persons who were present inside the premises and threatened them and also committed offences. The premises referred to therein, as informed by the petitioner appearing in person, is used for cricket net practice and marriage functions. There is some dispute amongst those who manage the said land and premises/property. The affidavit further states that the alleged goons manhandled the staff and labourers present on the site. In the clips circulated on social media, it is also visible that they were involved in throwing bricks and breaking the CCTV cameras installed at

the premises. An F.I.R. has already been lodged by Smt. Manorama Mishra, President, Karam Pradopi, who claims to be in possession of the premises situated at Dayanand Sewa Sansthan.

5. In the First Information Report, it has been alleged that she recognises Sri Amit Mishra, Rahul Shukla, Deepak Prakash, Arun Jaiswal and Anand Mohan Tiwari, Advocates. We have perused the F.I.R.

6. It is informed by the petitioner appearing in person that both the parties to the dispute pertaining to the aforesaid premises were called at the police station, where Saurabh Kumar Verma, Advocate whose name has figured in another matter taken up today in the bunch of petitions being leading petition being CRLP No. 8810 of 2023, was present, who has eight criminal cases against him and is alleged to be involved in property grabbing.

7. Learned Government Advocate, Dr. V.K. Singh, has placed before us a status report with regard to the F.I.R. lodged regarding the aforesaid incident, as supplied by the ACP, Qaiserbagh. The status report mentions the names of several lawyers, some of whom are mentioned in the writ petition and it also mentions Harshit Dixit, the accused, who as informed, is the brother of Sri Avneesh Dixit, General Secretary of the Central Bar Association. In a similar case referred in para 9, which was taken up today, the main allegations are against one Saurabh Kumar Verma, Advocate referred above who is the Junior Vice-President of the Central Bar Association and in this case, the brother of the General Secretary of the Central Bar Association is said to be involved. This is a disturbing scenario.

8. We take the status report on record.

9. A pen drive is annexed with the petition as Annexure No. 2, which, according to the petitioner, shows how the accused who were Advocates in large numbers trespassed upon the premises and indulged in hooliganism and vandalism, apart from other offences. We have taken out the pen drive from the petition and perused it and after watching the same, have put it back in the petition.

10. The video clip shows a disturbing picture where several of lawyers barged into the premises, shooed away the staff & labourers etc and roamed freely inside it in an attempt as stated by the petitioner and other members of the Bar who reside in the same vicinity to take over and grab the premises either for themselves or at the behest of one of the parties to the dispute. It is informed by members of the Bar that such group of lawyers acting as vigilantes promise to solve such dispute in an extra-legal manner putting not only the legal profession to disrepute but also circumventing the process of law and compromising it.

11. From the video clip in the pen drive provided by the ACP, Lucknow, we find the presence of a substantial number of police officers. Of course, the number of lawyers or those wearing the attire of lawyers is many more. Nevertheless, the question is why the police were mute spectators when such incident was taking place, as is alleged in the F.I.R. and the status report. Who were those police officers ? How long did the incident continue ? What action was taken ? Why was additional force not called and the persons not apprehended, as they had trespassed and entered the disputed premises without having any right or title, as claimed by the informant who has lodged the F.I.R. ? and what action was taken by the police personnel during the four hours for which the transgressors were inside the premises before the arrival of the ACP, Lucknow, as the presence of police personnel, at least 10-15 of them, is visible in the video clip throughout and as informed by the ACP of the area, who is present, the incident took place from 10:00 a.m. to 02:00 p.m. and he reached the spot immediately after 02:00 p.m. but by then, the incident was already over.

12. On being asked as to why additional force was not summoned if the alleged trespassers were present in the premises for almost four hours, he said that the force was called, however, he had no answer as to why the persons were not apprehended.

13. In fact, we find that the police personnel appeared to be treating the transgressors in quite a friendly manner and were visibly passive. We do not want to say much, except that the possibility of the local police personnel having facilitated the said illegalities cannot be ruled out.

14. Put up this matter tomorrow i.e. **23.07.2026 at 02:15 p.m.** before this Bench along with CRLP No. 8810 of 2023.

15. Let the Commissioner of Police, Lucknow, join these proceedings through video conferencing.

16. The Joint Commissioner of Police, Law and Order, DCP and ACP, Lucknow concerned, shall appear before this Court tomorrow, i.e. on 23.07.2026.

17. Before joining the proceedings, the Commissioner of Police, Lucknow, shall inquire into the matter as to why appropriate action was not taken when police personnel were present at the spot. He shall view the video clip copy of which is available with the ACP who is present.

18. This petition shall be connected along with the bunch of petitions, the leading writ petition being Criminal Misc. Writ Petition No. 8810 of 2023, which has been heard today.

19. The pen drive provided by the ACP, Lucknow, has been retained and shall be kept in a sealed cover along with the records of this case. The aforesaid video clip shall be saved separately on a computer by the office and shall be preserved.

20. Police Commissioner, Lucknow is directed to ensure security of the petitioner who has brought this cause before the Court.

(Manjive Shukla,J.) (Rajan Roy,J.)

July 22, 2026

Raj