# HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

**Writ Petition Criminal No. 2273 of 2026**

**05 November, 2026**

Vinayak Prajapat --Petitioner

**Versus**

State Of Uttarakhand and Others --Respondents

---

**Presence**:-

*Mr. Bibek Tripathi, learned counsel (through V.C.) with Mr. Pradeep Chamyal, learned counsel for petitioner.*

*Mr. Bhaskar Chandra Joshi, learned A.G.A. with Mr. Vijay Khandoori, learned Brief Holder for the State of Uttarakhand.*

---

**Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J. (Oral)**

Petitioner has impugned a First Information Report No.0463 of 2026 dated 16.09.2026 registered with Police Station Rishikesh, District Dehradun, under Sections 318(4), 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 61(2) of the BNS, 2023.

2. It is contended by learned counsel for petitioner that the FIR was lodged at the instance of respondent No.3 on the allegations that on 15.09.2026 certain persons were found negotiating and demanding money in the name of providing jobs at AIIMS and fake appointment letters and cash were recovered from them.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that FIR was lodged against the petitioner only on the basis of statements of co-accused persons and without any independent material. He further submits that one person namely Shiva has got interim relief from this Court, who is also named in the impugned FIR. It is further contended by learned counsel for petitioner that

petitioner is not working anywhere at present and he has no criminal antecedents and has no connection whatsoever with the recruitment process of AIIMS Rishikesh/AIIMS Kichha.

4. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that petitioner was not present at the alleged spot at the time of the alleged operation; nothing was recovered from him or at his instance; he is not alleged to have received any money from any candidate/victim, to have prepared or used any document, or to have held out any promise of employment to any person.

5. Per contra, learned State Counsel submits that during raid, 10 forged appointment letters were recovered from the house of petitioner at 503, Shivalik Residency, Birbhadra Road, Rishikesh.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for parties and having perused the first information report, this Court is of the view that FIR discloses commission of cognizable offences, the offences alleged against the petitioner are very serious in nature, therefore, no case is made out for quashing the impugned First Information Report. Moreover, 10 forged appointment letters were recovered from the house of the petitioner at Rishikesh.

7. Accordingly, the criminal writ petition fails and is dismissed *in-limine*.

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

(**Pankaj Purohit, J**.)
05.11.2026

PN
PREETI NEGI