



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Criminal No. 1431 of 2025

24 August, 2026

Puneet Agrawal

--Petitioner

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand & others

--Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. Narayan Har Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner.

Mr. Chitrarth Kandpal, learned Brief Holder for the State.

Mr. Karan Anand, learned counsel for respondent no.6.

Mr. Vinay Garg, learned counsel (appeared through V.C.) along with Mr. Rahul Consul, learned counsel for MDDA.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.

It is the case of the petitioner in the writ petition that the petitioner is disturbed by the fact that respondent no. 6 is plying a car in which "Nyayadish" is written in front and at the back of the car.

2. Petitioner contends that he has moved a complaint before Police Station Raipur on 02.09.2025, alleging an offence against respondent no. 6. When no first information report was lodged, petitioner moved an application dated 27.10.2025 before the 6th ACJM, Dehradun, under Section 175(3) of the BNSS, 2023, to register and investigate the crime against respondent no. 6.

3. It is admitted by the petitioner that the said application was rejected by the 6th ACJM, Dehradun, vide its judgment and order dated 12.01.2026. Feeling aggrieved by the said order of rejection, petitioner approached the learned Sessions Judge, Dehradun, by



filing Revision Petition No.216 of 2026, *Puneet Agrawal vs. State of Uttarakhand & Others*. Before filing the proceeding under Section 175(3) of the BNSS, 2023, the present writ petition has been filed for the following prayers:-

“(i) Issue a Writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the Respondent No. 2/District Magistrate, Dehradun cum CEO, Dehradun Smart City Project (DSCL) & Respondent No. 3/S.S.P., Dehradun to preserve in safe custody the data, photos and videos of Vehicle No. UK07- FF0014 White Honda City of three months i.e. from dated 02-07-2025 to 02-09-2025 used by Respondent No. 06 who impersonated himself to be a Judge and for that purpose displayed the designation "न्यायाधीश" at the front and back of this car. AND

(ii) Issue a Writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the Respondent no. 4/SHO, PS Raipur, Dehradun to preserve the CCTV footages of Dated 02-09- 2025 of PS: Raipur, Dehradun as per the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Paramvir Singh Saini vs Baljit Singh & Other in S.L.P.(Crl.) No.3543 of 2020 as the petitioner had visited the police station on that day to lodge an FIR against Respondent No. 06.”

4. Now, the position is that the revision petition has also been admitted and is pending disposal. Petitioner, instead of approaching the revisional court to get the relief, has unnecessarily filed the present writ petition for the aforesaid prayers.

5. In such view of the matter, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the matter. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. However, petitioner is at liberty to move an appropriate application before the learned Sessions Judge.

6. Interim order, if any, stands vacated.

7. Pending application, if any, stands disposed of accordingly.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
24.08.2026

AK