UKHC010068962026

2026:UHC:7676

HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Criminal No. 762 of 2026

24 August, 2026

Puneet Agrawal

--Petitioner

Versus

District Magistrate, Dehradun & 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 nos.4 & 5.
Mr. Vinay Garg, learned counsel (appeared through V.C.) along with Mr. Rahul Consul, learned counsel for the MDDA.
Mr. Sanat Kumar, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Ms. Lalit Mohini Bhatt and Mr. Rahul Jain, learned counsel for the applicant in intervention application (IA No.2/2026).
Mr. Arvind Kumar Shukla, learned counsel for the applicant in intervention application (IA No.3/2026).

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner challenging the notice dated 25.04.2026 issued under Section 3(1) of the U.P. Control of Goondas Act, 1970 (for short, "the Act, 1970") and all consequential proceedings arising there-from, including Case No. 9 of 2026, *State vs. Puneet Agrawal*, under the Act, 1970, registered at Police Station Raipur, District Dehradun, and another ancillary relief.

2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

3. Facts as culled out from the hearing of the petition are that the petitioner was issued the aforesaid notice under the Act, 1970, to call upon him to show cause as to why proceedings under the Act, 1970, be not initiated against him. Instead of responding to the said

notice, the petitioner filed the present writ petition before this Court. Subsequently, the petitioner replied to the impugned show cause notice and, after considering the reply of the petitioner to the show cause notice, the District Magistrate was pleased to pass the final order on 14.05.2026, whereby the petitioner was externed for six months from District Dehradun. The said order was challenged by the petitioner before the Commissioner by filing Appeal Gunda Act No. 3/2026, *Puneet Agrawal vs. District Magistrate*. The appeal too was decided by the learned Commissioner vide its judgment and order dated 18.07.2026, whereby the appeal was partly allowed and, after cancelling the order passed by the District Magistrate dated 14.05.2026, the matter was remanded to the District Magistrate for reconsideration.

4. Since the notice under the Act, 1970, has now been exhausted and has resulted into passing of a final order by the District Magistrate, as stated above, there is no point in keeping this writ petition pending. Accordingly, the present writ petition is dismissed as infructuous.

5. Petitioner has got the remedy to challenge the order passed by the District Magistrate afresh after the order of remand passed by the Commissioner, in accordance with law.

6. Interim order, if any, stands vacated.

7. Intervention applications (IA Nos.2/2026 and 3/2026) stand disposed of accordingly.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
24.08.2026

AK