



2026:AHC-LKO:40401

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 535 of 2026

Sushma Singh @ Khema Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Revenue Deptt.
Lko. And 5 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Pashupati Nath Dwivedi, Ashutosh Shukla
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Dilip Kumar Pandey

Court No. - 4

HON'BLE SYED QAMAR HASAN RIZVI, J.

1. Heard Shri Pashupati Nath Dwivedi, learned counsel for the petitioner, and Shri Alok Singh Chauhan, learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondents.

2. By means of the present public interest litigation, the petitioner has prayed for the following main relief:

"(I) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, preferably in the nature of mandamus, directing opposite party concerned specially, the opposite party No. 02 to constitute, within a fixed time, an Independent Special Enquiry Committee."

3. The learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the State-respondents has raised preliminary objection regarding the maintainability of the present Public Interest Litigation, as the petitioner has not disclosed the credentials and other details that are required under Sub-Rule (3-A) of Rule 1 of Chapter XXII of the Allahabad High Court Rules (Rules of Court, 1952), duly amended in the light of judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **State of Uttranchal versus Balwant Singh Chaufal & Others** reported in **2010 AIR SCW 1029**.

4. The learned Standing Counsel has relied upon the judgment passed by the Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Deenbandhu Samgra Swasthya Avam Siksha Shodh Sansthan versus Union of India and Others**; reported in **2025 SCC OnLine All 3541**. The relevant paragraphs of the said judgment is extracted here-in-below for

convenience:

"18. On the question of maintainability of the present petition for want of non-disclosure of the credentials as required under Sub-Rule (3-A), Rule 1 of Chapter XXII of the Allahabad High Court Rules, it would be pertinent to note that the aforesaid Rule has been framed in exercise of the Rule making power of the High Court, which is of quasi-legislative nature and has been incorporated as an amendment to Rule 1 of XXII with effect from 01.05.2010 and the validity of the same has been tested and upheld by the Division Bench of this Court in the case of Pankaj Srivastava Versus High Court of Judicature at Allahabad, reported in (2014) 3 UPLBEC 1832.

19. For ready reference, the said Rule is reproduced as under:

"(3-A) In addition to satisfying the requirements of the other rules in this chapter, the Petitioner seeking to file a Public Interest Litigation, should precisely and specifically state, in the affidavit to be sworn by him giving his credentials, the public cause he is seeking to spouse; that he has no personal or private interest in the matter; that there is no authoritative pronouncement by the Supreme Court or High Court on the question raised; and that the result of the litigation will not lead to any undue gain to himself or anyone associated with him, or any undue loss to any person, body of persons or the State."

20. The aforesaid Rule requires a person espousing a public cause, to file an affidavit narrating his credentials in precise and specific manner and also the public cause which is sought to be espoused.

21. The word 'credential' has a specific connotation and meaning. It has been defined in Black's Law Dictionary, 8th Edition as "1. A document or other evidence that proves one's authority or expertise. 2. A testimonial that a person is entitled to credit or to the right to exercise official power. 3. The letter of credence given to an ambassador or other representative of a foreign country. 4. Parliamentary law. Evidence of a delegate's entitlement to be seated and vote in a convention or other deliberative assembly."

22. Moreover, the Oxford English-English-Hindi Dictionary, 2nd Edition, explains credentials as the quality which makes a person perfect for the job or a document that is a proof that he has the training and education necessary to prove that he is a person qualified for doing the particular

job.

23. The requirement of disclosure of credentials from the petitioner is indeed necessary to bring on record the complete background of the person who is coming before the Court. This information helps to establish the petitioner's credibility, locus standi, and his genuineness. Providing credentials also demonstrates that the petitioner has the necessary expertise, knowledge and understanding of the gravity and seriousness involved in the matter. The said information should not be vague and indefinite. The word 'credentials' connotes the qualities and the experience of a person that make him suitable for doing a particular job."

5. Since the petitioner has failed to disclose the credentials in the manner as required under law, therefore, on this score alone, the present petition as Public Interest Litigation is not maintainable. Further, the pleadings as are available before the Court shows that the dispute as projected by the petitioner is purely personal in nature, particularly from the perusal of the application dated 14.09.2022 moved by one Vimal Kumar Shukla, Advocate as contained in Annexure No. 2 and the application dated 12.05.2026 filed by the petitioner as contained in Annexure No. 1 to the present petition.

6. Therefore, taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of this case, this Court is of the view that the present Public Interest Litigation is not maintainable. Accordingly, the present Public Interest Litigation is **dismissed as not maintainable.**

(Syed Qamar Hasan Rizvi,J.)

June 5, 2026

Manoj K.