2026:AHC:18364-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 1097 of 2026

Maranatha Full Gospel Ministries

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Manoj Kumar
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 2

HON'BLE ATUL SREEDHARAN, J.
HON'BLE SIDDHARTH NANDAN, J.

1. Heard Sri Manoj Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondents.

2. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioner who wants to have a religious congregation of worship within his private premises. He has stated that no action is taken by the State despite he has moved several representations by hand and post before the authorities of the State for grant of permission.

3. Instructions have come from the State. Paragraph no.18 is relevant. It is very clearly stated that there is no prohibition on the petitioner to conduct religious prayer meeting within his private premises. It is also stated that equal protection of the law is accorded by instrumentalities of the State to all citizens across the State without discrimination with regard to religion or any other consideration. The petitioner does not require any kind of permission under the law to pursue an act which is the petitioner's fundamental right under Article 25 of the Constitution of India subject to the fact that he conducts and carries out religious prayer meeting within its private premises of his own property.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner was put a question by this Court whether there is any procession which would be led on public land or road to which he has categorically answered that there is no procession to be carried out or conducted by the petitioner and that prayer would be restricted and limited only to the private premises of the petitioner.

5. Under the circumstances, the present writ petition is disposed off by observing that the petitioner has right to conduct the prayer as per

convenience in his own private premises without any permission from the State Government. However, if any occasion arises where it has to spill over the public road or public property, in such a situation, this Court mandates that the petitioner shall at least intimate the police and take any requisite permission under the law, if so require.

6. The manner in which protection, if required, is to be provided, the same is within the discretion of the State. However, it is a concomitant duty on the State to ensure that property, rights and life of the petitioner are protected at all cost. How this is done is entirely the discretion of the police.

7. With the above, the present writ petition stands **disposed off**.

January 27, 2026
Noman

(Siddharth Nandan,J.) (Atul Sreedharan,J.)