

(2025) 07 UK CK 0678

In the Uttarakhand High Court

Case No : Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 1419 Of 2024

Rajesh Negi

APPELLANT

Vs

State And Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 17-07-2025

Acts Referred:

Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 306

Citation : (2025) 07 UK CK 0678

Hon'ble Judges : Pankaj Purohit, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Nivesh Bahuguna, S.S. Chauhan

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Pankaj Purohit, J

1. Petitioner has filed this petition seeking a writ of mandamus to call for records of the Final Report No.05 of 2023 dated 02.02.2023 (Annexure No.1) in connection with FIR No.75 of 2022 P.S. Muni-ki-Reti, District Tehri Garhwal under Section 306 IPC and directing respondent nos.1 and 2 to provide copies of records/ evidences collected during investigation of the case to the petitioner in accordance with law.

2. It is the case of petitioner that he is the informant on whose behest FIR No.75 of 2022 was lodged against respondent no.3. It is also an admitted case that after investigation, final report has been submitted being F.R. No.05 of 2023 dated 02.02.2023 (Annexure No.1). On the final report, petitioner was given notice by the learned CJM, Tehri Garhwal; he appeared before the said Court and submitted his "no objection" and requested the learned CJM to accept the final report. The Final Report No.5/2023 was accordingly accepted and the matter was closed vide order dated 23.03.2023.

3. It is after acceptance of the final report and closure of case, petitioner challenged the order dated 23.03.2023 by filing revision petition before the

learned Sessions Judge, Tehri Garhwal who vide judgment dated 03.05.2024 dismissed the revision. It is observed by learned Sessions Judge while rejecting the revision petition, in paragraph no.10, that the legal procedure has been adopted by the learned trial Court inasmuch as on the final report, notices were issued to the petitioner-informant. He appeared before the Trial Court and submitted his "no objection" to the final report. Accordingly, the final report has been accepted. For this reason, the Revisional Court did not find any illegality in the order and, accordingly, revision petition was dismissed.

4. Instead of challenging those orders, petitioner approached this Court by filing this petition with a prayer for direction to the respondents to supply the copies of records and all evidences of the case collected during investigation. Once the final report has been submitted and case is closed, there is no use of making such a prayer.

5. The writ petition is misconceived and is, accordingly, dismissed.