



2026:AHC-LKO:41261

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - C No. - 6305 of 2026

Satyam Yadav

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Deptt. Of Higher
Education, Lko. And Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	In Person, Chinmay Mishra
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Savitra Vardhan Singh

Court No. - 3

HON'BLE ARUN KUMAR SINGH DESHWAL, J.

1. Amended Petition filed by the petitioner is taken on record.
2. Heard Shri Chinmay Mishra, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Savitra Vardhan Singh, learned counsel for the University of Lucknow and learned Chief Standing Counsel for the State- respondent.
3. The instant petition has been filed with the following main prayers:-

"I. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned notice dated 21.05.2026 issued by the respondent no.5 contained as Annexure No.1 to the writ petition.

I.A. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned expulsion order dated 08.06.2026 issued by the respondent no.2 contained in Annexure No.12.

II. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Certiorari quashing the suspension order dated 30.08.2025 against the show cause notice dated 19.08.2025 upon summoning it.

III. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondent authorities not to restrain the petitioner from appearing his final semester examination scheduled from 12.06.2026 as contained in the Annexure No.8 to this writ petition and also not to withheld the result of the petitioner.

IV. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent authorities to pay the compensation for the consequences faced by the petitioner in pursuance to the violation of Fundamental Rights of the petitioner and agony caused by the act of respondent authorities."

4. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the impugned expulsion order is an ex parte order and has been passed without giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, therefore the order deserves to be quashed.

5. It is further submitted that even punishment of expulsion is extreme which is not commensurate the charges levelled against him. Per contra learned counsel for the University has submitted that several show cause notices have been duly served upon the petitioner and the reply of the petitioner was also considered and statements of other witnesses show misconduct on the part of the petitioner.

6. It is lastly submitted by learned counsel for the University that the petitioner has an alternative remedy to challenge this order before the Chancellor under Section 68 of the U.P. State Universities Act. The present petition deserves to be dismissed on the ground of alternative remedy.

7. Considering the facts taking into account the nature of allegation as well as the petitioner himself filed an affidavit accepting his misconduct at earlier occasion, and taking into account the show cause notices were duly served upon the petitioner and after recording the statement of the witnesses, impugned order was passed, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the expulsion order.

8. Accordingly the writ petition is ***dismissed***.

9. However, the petitioner is given liberty to avail remedy available under law.

10. After dictation of dismissal order of this petition, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the University has taken two mobile phones of the petitioner and he has also filed an application to return these

mobile phones of the petitioner. Therefore, University may be directed to return the mobile phones to the petitioner.

11. Considering the aforesaid request, the University is directed to consider the request of petitioner regarding returning of two mobile phones of the petitioner, if there is no legal impediment.

(Arun Kumar Singh Deshwal,J.)

June 16, 2026

Muk