



IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL
THE HON'BLE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. MANOJ KUMAR GUPTA
AND
THE HON'BLE JUSTICE MR. SUBHASH UPADHYAY
Writ Petition (PIL) No.55 of 2024
19th August, 2026

Jitendra Singh -----Petitioner

Versus

State of Uttarakhand and Others ----Respondents

Presence:-
Mr. Rahul Consul, learned counsel for the petitioner through V.C.
Mr. Gajendra Tripathi, learned Standing Counsel for the State of
Uttarakhand/ respondent nos.1 to 3.
Mr. Piyush Garg, learned counsel for respondent no.4.

JUDGMENT : (per Mr. Manoj Kumar Gupta C. J.)

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The present writ petition has been filed praying for quashing of a notification dated 10.09.2020 issued by the Governor in exercise of powers under sub-section (4) of Section 24 of the Right to Information Act, 2005 and sub-section (1) of Section 4 of the Uttar Pradesh Vigilance Establishment Act, 1965 read with Para 2(b) of the Notification No.1602/Thirty Nine (2)-217-64 dated 29 August 1977 of Uttar Pradesh Government declaring the Vigilance Department and Vigilance Establishment as Intelligence Organizations.



3. The petitioner has also challenged the communication dated 23.02.2024 whereby the petitioner was informed that the information sought by him under Right to Information Act in respect of the status of his complaint could not be provided to him as the Vigilance Department and the Vigilance Establishment have been notified as Intelligence Organizations and were, consequently, exempt from the provisions of the Right to Information Act, 2005.

4. On 01.04.2024, a Co-ordinate Bench passed the following order:

“Mr. Rahul Consul, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. P.C. Bisht, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel with Ms. Rajni Supyal Latwal, learned Brief Holder for the State.

2. Counsel for the petitioner has referred to the letter dated 16.10.2023 (Annexure-4 to the writ petition), whereby the petitioner has sought an information as to what final decision has been taken on the complaint dated 11.10.2023. Counsel for the petitioner submits that though the status of the complaint is registered, but the same is not being reflected.

3. Learned State Counsel will get instructions as to what is the status of the complaint of the petitioner dated 11.10.2023.

4. List on 02.05.2024.”

5. In pursuance to the aforesaid direction, a counter affidavit has been filed on behalf of the Vigilance Establishment and wherein it is stated that the Vigilance



Establishment, after due inquiry, had forwarded its report to the State Government for further action in the matter.

6. In view of the aforesaid stand, this Court by its order dated 29.07.2026 directed learned State Counsel to obtain instructions from the Secretary (Personnel and Vigilance) as to what decision has been taken by the State Government on the report of the Vigilance Establishment.

7. Pursuant to the said direction, the State Counsel has placed on record the instructions received from the State Government. Enclosed along with the instructions is an order dated 03.12.2024 addressed to the Director, Vigilance Establishment, Uttarakhand, Dehradun intimating him that the State Government, after considering the complaint of the petitioner and report of the Vigilance Department, has decided to drop the proceedings as the complaint was found to be motivated and an outcome of vengeance.

8. The State Government has thus closed the proceedings on the basis of the complaint filed by the petitioner.

9. The relief prayed for by the petitioner in the writ petition that he should be apprised of the status of his complaint thus stands duly granted in view of the orders



passed in the present petition and the disclosures made by the respondents.

10. The writ petition is, accordingly, disposed of as having become infructuous.

11. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(MANOJ KUMAR GUPTA, C. J.)

(SUBHASH UPADHYAY, J.)

Dated: 19.08.2026
SS