



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. MANOJ KUMAR GUPTA
AND
HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE SUBHASH UPADHYAY
18TH JUNE, 2026
WRIT PETITION (M/B) NO. 523 OF 2026

Anupam SharmaPetitioner.

Versus

State of Uttarakhand & othersRespondents.

Counsel for the Petitioner : Mr. V.P. Bahuguna and Mr. Saif Hameed, learned counsel.

Counsel for the State : Mr. B.S. Parihar, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel with Mr. B.P.S. Mer, learned Standing Counsel.

JUDGMENT : (per Mr. Manoj Kumar Gupta, C.J.)

1. The petitioner has prayed for quashing of the communication dated 13.04.2026, whereby the Principal, Veer Chandra Singh Garhwali Rajkiya Ayurvedigyan Sodh Sansthan, Srinagar, Garhwal, has apprised the District Magistrate, Dehradun of the name of persons who have violated the conditions of the bond furnished by them at the time of taking admission in MBBS courses from the said Institution. The communication indicates that, as a consequence of the petitioner having violated the conditions of the bond, he is liable to pay a sum of Rs.32,87,316/-. In pursuance of the said communication, citation to appear has been issued on 06.05.2026 for a sum of Rs.36,16,047/- which is also under challenge in the present writ petition.



2. The case of the petitioner is that he rendered service from 16.07.2016 to 15.07.2017 on contract basis at a remote place and again from 10.08.2017 to 06.02.2019. It is also his case that, after completing his MBBS, the petitioner got admission in PG course, and after completing the same, he served as Senior Resident till 2025. The petitioner is now stated to be willing to render services at remote place in compliance of the conditions of the bond and is further stated to have made representation in this behalf, annexed as Annexure 12 to the writ petition.

3. The submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the respondents be directed to consider the representation of the petitioner and the impugned recovery be kept in abeyance in the meantime.

4. In the instructions furnished by the Joint Director, Administration, it is stated that the Department has not taken cognizance of the representation of the petitioner in view of the fact that the District Magistrate has already initiated proceedings for recovery of the bond amount.

5. The object of obtaining the bond was to ensure that the petitioner, who had taken benefit of subsidized



education, renders service in the remote area of the State. As the petitioner is now ready and willing to serve at a remote place for the remaining period as per bond, the mere fact that recovery proceedings are underway, would not be an impediment in considering his representation.

6. Accordingly, the present writ petition is disposed of with a direction to the competent authority to consider and decide the representation (Annexure-12) within a period of three weeks from the date of communication of the instant order along with photostat copy of the representation. In the event, the communication is made within one week from today, then recovery in pursuance of the impugned order will remain in abeyance till the representation is decided. If the representation is accepted, the petitioner would be bound to render service as per the offer made by him and in such an event, the recovery proceedings would stand quashed automatically.

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

MANOJ KUMAR GUPTA, C.J.

SUBHASH UPADHYAY, J.

Dated: 18th June, 2026

NISHANT