



SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>WPCRL/ 1640/2026</u> Paras Chugh --Petitioner Versus State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent <u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u> Mr. Lalit Sharma, Mr. Vipul Sharma and Ms. Anmol Sandhu, learned counsel for the petitioner. 2. Mr. V.S. Pal, learned A.G.A. for the State. 3. By means of the present writ petition, petitioner seek quashing of FIR/Case Crime No. 413 of 2026 dated 08.08.2026 under Sections 109, 115(2), 118(1), 191(2), 191(3), 3(5) and 324(2) of B.N.S. and Sections 3(1)® and 3(1)(s) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989. 4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in the impugned F.I.R. It is contended that the petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence at the relevant time and, therefore, there is no credible material connecting him with the alleged incident; that, the attempt to arrest the petitioner is not founded upon any incriminating material collected during



		investigation, but is the result of political and extraneous pressure arising out of continuous demonstrations and dharnas organized by various political parties, wherein the immediate arrest of the persons named in the F.I.R. has been demanded. 5. Learned counsel for the petitioner would further submit that the petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence when the alleged incident took place; that, the entire incident was captured by the CCTV cameras installed at or near the place of occurrence and the said footage would demonstrate the absence of the petitioner from the spot, therefore, the criminal proceedings against the petitioner is wholly unwarranted. 6. On the previous date of hearing, learned State counsel was directed to obtain specific instructions with regard to the presence of the petitioner at the place of occurrence at the relevant time, as also as to whether the petitioner was identified as one of the assailants in the manner alleged in the impugned F.I.R. Learned State counsel was further directed to obtain and examine the CCTV footage covering the place of occurrence from the Investigating Officer and to verify whether the petitioner was present therein at the relevant time. 7. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, learned State counsel, on the basis of written instructions received from the
--	--	--



		Investigating Officer, submits that the petitioner was not found present at the place of occurrence at the time of the alleged incident. He further submits that the statement of the complainant, recorded under Section 180 of the B.N.S.S., does not attribute the presence or participation of the petitioner in the alleged incident. He would further submit that according to the said statement, the petitioner was identified only on the basis of his having allegedly pointed towards the crowd gathered outside the hospital and not as a participant or assailant in the incident in question. 8. Learned State counsel further submits that he has personally perused the CCTV footage obtained during the course of investigation and the petitioner is not seen at the place of occurrence at the relevant time. He further submits, on the basis of the written instructions, that upon verification of the material collected during investigation, the Investigating Officer has found no material connecting the petitioner with the alleged offences and has, accordingly, exonerated the petitioner from the allegations contained in the impugned F.I.R. 9. In view of the aforesaid subsequent development and the specific instructions placed before the Court by learned State counsel, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner does not wish to press the
--	--	---



			present writ petition, as no surviving grievance remains to be adjudicated. 10. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having considered the subsequent development brought on record, this Court finds that the petitioner has been exonerated by the Investigating Officer during investigation and, as per the instructions placed before the Court, the CCTV footage does not establish his presence at the place of occurrence at the relevant time. In these circumstances, no further adjudication is required in the present petition. 11. The written instructions produced by learned State counsel are taken on record. 12. Registry is directed to paginate the written instructions and place the same on the record. 13. In view of the statement made by learned counsel for the petitioner and the subsequent development noticed hereinabove, the present criminal writ petition is dismissed as not pressed. It is, however, made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the allegations against any other accused. 14. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of accordingly. (Alok Mahra, J.) 19-08-2026 Mamta
--	--	--	--

MA

MTA

RANI

Digitally signed by MAMTA RANI
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF
UTTARAKHAND, ou=HIGH COURT
OF UTTARAKHAND,
2.5.4.20=6a812005bcbcf4662443e
584af1449e430ef900bf09a6d67eb
bd642671329b,
postalCode=263001,
st=Uttarakhand,
serialNumber=5de1751a4f1d9cabf
d54852e9e68911ca8b66dd26690a
191648ab5d8dd004ef0,
cn=MAMTA RANI
Date: 2026.08.19 17:47:06 +05'30'