



2026:AHC:171182

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 17151 of 2017

Rais Hasan

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Govt. Of U.P. And 5 Ors.

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Sushil Kumar Rao, Sr. Advocate
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 34

(SN.13)

HON'BLE ANISH KUMAR GUPTA, J.

1. Heard Sri O.P. Singh, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Sri Sushil Kumar Rao, learned counsel for the petitioners and Sri Prakash Kumar Srivastava, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State.

2. The instant petition has been filed with following prayers:

"(i) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari in quashing the impugned order dated 9.3.2017 passed by Principal Secretary, Irrigation Uttar Pradesh Lucknow/respondent No. 1 i.e. Annexure 24 to the Writ Petition) Voluntary.

(ii) issue a writ order or direction, in the nature of mandamus, directing and commanding the respondent No. 1 to pay the full monthly salary to the petitioner also from the date of the suspension order dated 12.6.2000 i.e. (Annexure 7 to the Writ Petition) to till date of its revocation dated 23.8.2001 i.e. Annexure 14 to the Writ Petition) along with 18% interest till the date of its actual payment made to the petitioner (iii) issue a writ order or direction, in the nature of mandamus, directing and commanding the respondents to pay the salary to the petitioner w.e.f. 1.6.1998 till the date of the acceptance of petitioner's Voluntary Retirement of Service (VRS) order dated

23.8.2001 i.e. (Annexure 14 to the Writ Petition) and also add five (5) years of additional service for the purpose of computation of pension as per Government Order dated 24.8.1977 i.e. (Annexure 21 to the Writ Petition) and to calculate the revised pension of the petitioner on the basis of his VRS dated 23.8.2001.

(iv) issue a writ order or direction, in the nature of mandamus, directing and commanding the respondents to give the entire benefit of Voluntary Retirement of Service (VRS) to the petitioner as per the Government Order dated 24.8.1977 i.e. (Annexure 21 to the Writ Petition) and the order dated 26.2.2007 passed by Assistant Account Officer/Director, Directorate of Pension U. P. Lucknow/respondent No. 6 with all consequential benefits w.e.f. 1.5.1998 and onwards."

3. The briefly stated facts of the case are that the petitioner herein was working on the post of Executive Engineer, Irrigation/Works Manager in the office of Irrigation Workshop, Naini, Allahabad and the petitioner got sick and confined to bed and started taking medical treatment from 25.04.1998 and the petitioner was sanctioned medical leave from 01.05.1998 till 31.05.1998, which was duly sanctioned by Chief Engineer (Mechanical), respondent no.3.

4. It is the case of the petitioner that thereafter the condition of the petitioner got deteriorated despite the medical treatment. Thereafter, the petitioner applied for two months' medical leave from 01.06.1998 till 02.08.1998. Despite the medical leaves were available to the petitioner the same were not granted to the petitioner. Thereafter, it is the case of the petitioner that he has gone to Hyderabad where his wife and children were residing for his treatment and wherefrom he continued to send the applications for medical leave and he continued to request for sanction of medical leave, which were not sanctioned to him.

5. Thereafter, vide order dated 22.04.2000 he was transferred as Executive Engineer (Irrigation) at Bahraich. After coming to know about the said transfer order, having regard to his medical condition, the

petitioner applied for voluntary retirement from service on 17.05.2000. Thereafter, vide order dated 12.06.2000, the petitioner was suspended on the ground of his unauthorized absence from 01.06.1998 and he was attached to the office of Engineer-in-Chief (Mechanical), Irrigation Department, U.P., Lucknow. Vide order dated 27.01.2001, he responded to the suspension order vide his letter dated 04.08.2000 informing that he is sick and is not in position to join the services and is undergoing the medical treatment.

6. Being aggrieved by the suspension order in 12.06.2000, the petitioner had filed a Writ Petition No. 42737 of 2000, the same was disposed of vide order dated 14.02.2001, whereby the direction was issued to the respondents to conclude the inquiry preferably within three months from the date of certified copy of the order. Being aggrieved by the order dated 14.02.2001, the petitioner has moved an application for clarification of the modification. Thereupon, vide order dated 04.05.2021, the order dated 14.02.2001 was modified whereby the respondents were directed to consider the grant of voluntary retirement to the petition as well as the medical leave, as was represented by the petitioner in his representations dated 17.05.2000 and 24.06.2000. Thereupon, as per the aforesaid direction issued by this Court on 04.05.2001, vide order dated 23.08.2001, the voluntary retirement application dated 17.05.2000 submitted by the petitioner was accepted and allowed and the petitioner was granted voluntary retirement with immediate effect vide order dated 23.08.2001. By a separate order of the same date i.e., 23.08.2001, the petitioner was also sanctioned leave without pay from 01.06.1998 till 22.08.2001 i.e., total 1,178 days.

7. On the representation of the petitioner, the petitioner was directed to appear before the Regional Medical Board, Allahabad, for his medical checkup, whereupon vide letter dated 02.08.2002, Secretary, Regional Board, Allahabad, informed the Superintendent Engineer (Irrigation), Lucknow, after the medical examination of the petitioner, the petitioner is unfit to join the service and he was advised six weeks' bed rest. Pursuant to the suspension order, the inquiry proceedings were also initiated against the petitioner and the Inquiry Officer has submitted an *ex-parte* inquiry report against the petitioner. However, in the inquiry report it has

been accepted by the Inquiry Officer that the petitioner was sick.

8. Being aggrieved by the second order, whereby the petitioner was sanctioned leave from 01.06.1998 till 22.08.2001 without pay, the petitioner herein filed Writ Petition No. 27167 of 2004, which was disposed of vide order 21.07.2004, directing the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner against the order 23.08.2001, whereby the leave without pay for 1178 days was sanctioned to the petitioner. In view of the directions issued by this Court on 21.07.2004, the petitioner moved a fresh representation, which was rejected vide order dated 19.10.2004 on the ground that since the application for sanction of medical leave has been moved by the petitioner without the certificate of the Chief Medical Officer concerned, therefore, the medical leave cannot be sanctioned. Being aggrieved vide judgement and order dated 19.10.2004 as well as the order dated 23.08.2001, the petitioner again filed for a **Writ Petition No. 60572 of 2005**, which was disposed of vide judgment and order dated 12.07.2016, in the following terms:

"1. Heard Sri O.P. Singh, learned Senior Counsel, appearing on behalf of petitioner.

2. This writ petition is directed against order dated 23.08.2001 (Annexure 10 to the writ petition) passed by Secretary, Irrigation sanctioning absence of petitioner from 01.06.1998 upto 22.08.2001 as leave without pay.

3. Petitioner claimed that aforesaid period should have been treated as leave on medical ground and thus made a representation which has been rejected vide impugned order dated 19.10.2004 (Annexure 16 to the writ petition) wherein in Para 3 (2) (3) it has been said that period of absence would not be treated as leave on medical ground for the reason that petitioner did not appear before Medical Board at Allahabad and did not submit any medical certificate hence, leave on medical ground was inadmissible.

4. Learned counsel for petitioner, drew our attention to the certificate dated 02.08.2000 issued by Secretary, Regional

Medical Board verifying that petitioner was not fit and recommended that he should undergo further treatment for a period of six weeks. A copy of the aforesaid certificate has been filed as annexure 6 to the writ petition. A reference of this medical certificate has been made in para 14 and 15 of the writ petition.

5. In counter affidavit filed by respondents, para 14 and 15 of writ petition have been admitted and it is also admitted that Medical Board at Allahabad recommended six weeks further treatment. Once it is evident that petitioner was ill and not in a capacity to attend duty for medical reasons which was duly verified by Medical Board, rejection of leave on medical ground and sanction of leave without pay for the aforesaid period on the ground that Medical Board certificate was not produced by petitioner is clearly erroneous and contrary to material available on record. Hence, impugned order insofar as it deny sanction of leave on medical ground and instead sanction leave without pay, is patently illegal and cannot be sustained.

6. In the result writ petition is allowed. Both the orders dated 23.08.2001 (Annexure 10 to the writ petition) and 19.10.2004 (Annexure 16 to the writ petition) are hereby set aside. Respondent competent authority is directed to pass a fresh order in accordance with law and in the light of observations made above, expeditiously, and in any case within three months from the date of production of certified copy of this order before him. Thereafter it shall recommend/fix retiral benefits of petitioner in accordance with law and pay dues, if any, within further three months."

9. Pursuant to the aforesaid representation filed by the petitioner, the petitioner herein moved a detailed representation before the Principal Secretary, Department of Irrigation, State of U.P. on 28.07.2016, which was received in the office of the respondent on 17.08.2016, whereupon vide impugned order dated 09.03.2017, the said representation of the

petitioner was decided and the petitioner was sanctioned the medical leave w.e.f. 01.06.1998 till 05.11.1998 with pay i.e., total 158 days as this was the only available medical leave in his service report. Thereafter, from 06.11.1998 till 11.06.2000, prior to the date of suspension of the petitioner, the petitioner was granted the medical leave without pay for 583 days. However, with regard to the period of suspension i.e., 12.06.2000 till 22.08.2001 i.e., total 437 days of period of suspension, the petitioner was held to be entitled only for subsistence allowance for the said period. Being aggrieved by the aforesaid impugned order dated 09.03.2017, the instant writ petition has been filed by the petitioner herein.

10. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the direction issued by this Court, vide order dated 10.07.2016, in Writ A No. 60572 of 2005, the petitioner was entitled for a medical leave for 1178 day and since his voluntary retirement has been accepted and no punishment order was passed, in view of the leave sanctioned to the petitioner, therefore, the petitioner ought to have been treated in continuity in service from 12.06.2000 to 22.08.2001 without suspension. Thus, the petitioner ought to have been paid the full salary instead of the subsistence allowance as has been directed to be paid by the impugned order.

11. It is further the case of the petitioner that even the subsistence allowance for the aforesaid period has not been paid to the petitioner.

12. With regard to non-payment of subsistence allowance, learned Senior Counsel has relied upon the letter dated 16.05.2017 issued by the Manager, Irrigation Workshop Division, Allahabad to the Senior Staff Officer of the Office of Chief Engineer (Mechanical), Irrigation Department, Allahabad. which is Annexed as Annexure RA- 2 to the rejoinder affidavit filed on behalf of the petitioner.

13. Learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has further relied upon a Government Order dated 24.08.1977 and submits that once the voluntary retirement of the petitioner has been accepted by the respondents, the petitioner is entitled for 5 years additional service period to be added for the purposes of calculating the pensionary and retirement dues admissible

to the petitioner, unless the integrity of such employee is doubtful and since the petitioner's integrity is not doubtful, therefore, he is entitled for the addition of 5 years service for the purpose of calculating the retiral dues available to the petitioner.

14. In support of the submission, learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgment in ***Dr. Brijesh Kumar Shukla vs. Director, Pension, Nideshalaya, U.P., Lucknow in reported in 2014 (5) ADJ 668 DB.***

15. Sri Brijesh Kumar Srivastava, learned Standing Counsel for the State submits that in compliance of the order dated 12.07.2016 passed by this Court in Writ A No. 60572 of 2005, all the available medical leave with pay has already been granted to the petitioner and further the petitioner has been granted medical leave without pay prior to the date of his suspension. However, for the period of suspension, if the medical leave would have been granted to the petitioner, that would have been the medical leave without pay. In such view of the matter, for the suspension period, the case of the petitioner has been limited to payment of subsistence allowance for the period of suspension. If the medical leave is also granted for the aforesaid suspension period, the petitioner would not have got even subsistence allowance and such medical leave ought to have been granted without pay. Therefore, there cannot be any grievance of the petitioner with the impugned order.

16. It is further submitted by learned Counsel for the respondents that with regard to the claim of the petitioner for addition of five years service in terms of Government Order dated 24.08.1977, which is Annexed as Annexure 21 to the instant writ petition, it is submitted by learned Standing Counsel for the State that the benefits granted under the 1977 Government Order, were not as a matter of right, but they were discretionary. Therefore, the petitioner cannot claim as a matter of right the said benefits. Further, it has been pointed out by learned Standing Counsel for the State that the said benefit has already been withdrawn by the Government Order dated 08.12.2008. Therefore, in view of the said Government Order dated 08.12.2008, the said benefit is now not available to the petitioner even as the discretionary relief. In such view of the

matter, learned Standing Counsel for the State seeks dismissal of the instant writ petition.

17. Having heard the rival submissions so made by learned counsel for the parties, this Court has carefully gone through the records of the case. The facts of the case have already been noted hereinabove.

18. It is admitted position in the instant case that from 01.06.1998 till 11.06.2000, the petitioner was absent from his duties due to his medical condition. However, for want of the relevant certificates as required, for want of the reliable medical certificate for sanctioning the medical leave to the petitioner in terms of the Government Order dated 28.07.1989 as well as the Civil Service Regulations, Clause 419B and 487, the petitioner was suspended from 12.06.2000. However, later in terms of the directions issued by this Court in the previous round of petitions filed by the petitioner. The application of the petitioner for voluntary retirement filed by the petitioner on 17.05.2000 was accepted and the petitioner was permitted to voluntarily retire. Thus, he was held to be in continued in service and and though the disciplinary proceedings were initiated against the petitioner for his unauthorized leave due to non-sanction of the medical leave to him, once the medical leave was sanctioned to the petitioner, vide order dated 23.08.2001, the suspension order was also revoked and thereafter as per the direction of this Court in the second round of the writ petition filed by the petitioner, the petitioner has already been sanctioned medical leave from 01.06.1998 till 11.06.2000. Though, for the period from 01.06.1998 till 05.11.1998, the leave was sanctioned with pay and from 06.11.1998 till 11.06.2000, the leave was sanctioned without pay. However, since the petitioner was under suspension and otherwise also admittedly was not in a position to work due to his medical condition, the claim of the petitioner was limited to the subsistence allowance for the period from 12.06.2000 till 22.08.2001. If instead of sanctioning the subsistence allowance, the medical leave without pay is sanctioned to the petitioner for the said period from 12.06.2000 till 22.08.2001, he would not be entitled even for the subsistence allowance. In such view of the matter, this Court do not find any illegality in the impugned order dated 09.03.2017.

19. However, as has been pointed out by learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner, from the letter dated 16.05.2017, written by the Manager (Irrigation), Workshop Division, Allahabad, that though the amount for subsistence allowance to the extent of Rs. 1,55,231/- was sanctioned to be paid to the petitioner, however, it is claimed by the Senior Counsel for the petitioner that the said amount has not yet been paid to the petitioner. In such circumstances, if the aforesaid amount has not been paid to the petitioner, the same shall be ensured by the responders to be paid to the petitioner within a period of eight weeks from the date of production of certified copy of this order.

20. So far as the claim of the petitioner regarding the benefit of five years additional service to be granted to the petitioner due to acceptance of his voluntary retirement in terms of 24.08.1977. It is necessary to take note of the Government Order dated 24.08.1977, which reads as under:

"महत्वपूर्ण शासनादेश

उत्तर प्रदेश शासन

कार्मिक अनुभाग-1, संख्या 5/7/77 (3)-कार्मिक 1, लखनऊ, दिनांक 24
अगस्त, 1977

विषय- स्वेच्छा से सेवानिवृत्त होने वाले कर्मचारियों को पेंशन आदि में अतिरिक्त
सेवा के लाभ का दिया जाना।

कार्यालय ज्ञाप

महोदय,

1- मुझे यह कहने का निदेश हुआ है कि उत्तर प्रदेश फन्डामेन्टल रूल, 56 (संशोधन) अधिनियम, 1976 (उत्तर प्रदेश अधिनियम संख्या 33, 1976) द्वारा संशोधित मूल नियम 56 के अनुसार स्वेच्छा सेवानिवृत्ति की आयु 50 वर्ष से घटाकर 45 वर्ष हो गयी है। इसके साथ ही उक्त संशोधन अधिनियम द्वारा मूल नियम 56 के खण्ड (ख) में बढ़ाये गये प्रतिबन्धात्मक खण्ड में यह भी प्राविधान कर दिया गया है कि जहाँ कोई सरकारी सेवक जो इस नियम के अधीन स्वेच्छा सेवानिवृत्त होता है या जिसे स्वेच्छा सेवानिवृत्ति होने की अनुज्ञा दी जाती है वहाँ नियुक्ति प्राधिकारी उसे पेंशन और उत्पादन के, यदि कोई हो, प्रयोजनार्थ पाँच

वर्ष की या ऐसी अवधि की, जिसमें यह कार्य किया होता, यदि वह अपनी अधिवर्षता की आयु के साधारण दिनांक तक रहता, जो भी कम हो, अतिरिक्त सेवा के लाभ की अनुज्ञा दे सकता है। सामान्यतया अतिरिक्त सेवा का उक्त लाभ सभी सरकारी सेवकों को अनुमन्य होगा, किन्तु अत्यधिक परिस्थितियों में, जहाँ किसी सेवक की चरित्र पंजी से उसकी सत्यनिष्ठा संदिग्ध प्रकट हो, यह लाभ अनुमन्य न होगा।

2- उक्त प्राविधान से यह विदित होता है कि यदि कोई सरकारी सेवक, जिसकी अधिवर्षता आयु 50 वर्ष है, 45 वर्ष या अधिक, किन्तु 53 वर्ष की आयु प्राप्त करने पर स्वेच्छा सेवानिवृत्त होता है या जिसे अच्छा सेवानिवृत्त होने की अनुज्ञा दी जाती है, तो उसको पेंशन तथा उपादान, यदि कोई हो, के प्रयोजन के लिए पाँच वर्ष की अतिरिक्त सेवा का लाभ दिया जा सकता है। यदि कोई सरकारी सेवक 53 वर्ष की आयु प्राप्त करने के बाद किसी समय स्वेच्छा सेवानिवृत्त होता है या स्वेच्छा सेवानिवृत्त होने की अनुज्ञा दी जाती है तो उसको पाँच वर्ष से कम उतनी ही अवधि की अतिरिक्त सेवा का लाभ दिया जा सकता है जितनी अवधि में वह अधिवर्षता के साधारण दिनांक तक सेवा में रहता। यद्यपि उक्त प्राविधान के फलस्वरूप किसी सरकारी सेवक को पाँच वर्ष की अतिरिक्त सेवा का लाभ दिया जायेगा, तथापि पेंशन तथा उपादान के आगणन हेतु उसकी परिलब्धियाँ वही मानी जायेंगी जो वह स्वेच्छा सेवानिवृत्त के दिनांक को प्राप्त कर रहा था। अवर सेवा के कर्मचारियों के सम्बन्ध में जिसकी अधिवर्षता आयु 60 वर्ष है, ऊपर उल्लिखित उपबन्ध (*Mutatis Mutandis*) लागू होंगे।

3- आपसे अनुरोध है कि आप कृपया उपरोक्त प्राविधानों को ध्यान में रखे तथा अपने अधीनस्थ समस्त पेंशन स्वीकृतकर्ता अधिकारियों की जानकारी में संशोधित मूल नियम, 56 के उपर्युक्त प्राविधान भली प्रकार ला दें तथा यह निदेश दे दें कि स्वेच्छा सेवानिवृत्त होने वाले सरकारी सेवकों को उपर्युक्त सुविधा का लाभ देने के लिए आवश्यक कार्यवाही तत्परता से यथाशीघ्र करें।”

21. From the perusal of the aforesaid Government Order it is apparent that it has been left to the discretionary of the Appointing Authority to grant the benefit of five years additional service for such period prior to the age of superannuation, whichever is earlier can be granted to a Government servant for the purposes of pension and other retiral dues. It has also been provided that generally such additional service benefits shall be available to all the Government servants. However, if the integrity of any Government servant is doubtful, these benefits shall not be granted.

22. In the instant case, though, the disciplinary proceedings were initiated against the petitioner due to his unauthorized leave, due to non-sanctioning of the medical leave, which were later sanctioned pursuant to the directions of the Court, however, there is no allegation on behalf of the respondents that the integrity of the petitioner was ever doubtful. In such view of the matter, the petitioner is entitled for the additional five years service.

23. In view thereof, in terms of the Government Order dated 24.08.1977, the petitioner is entitled for the addition of 5 years service for the purposes of calculating the pension and other retiral dues available to the petitioner after the acceptance of his voluntary retirement. Though, it has been contended on behalf of the respondents that the said benefit has already been taken back by the Government order dated 08.10.2008, however, the learned counsel for the respondent is not in a position to demonstrate that the said Government order dated 08.10.2008 is applicable with retrospective effect. Once, the said Government order is silent about its applicability, it has to be presumed that it will be prospective in nature.

24. While dealing with Government Orders dated 24.08.1977 as well as Government Order dated 08.10.2008, this Court in **Dr. Brijesh Kumar Shukla** (supra) has observed as under:

"9. From proviso 56 A which has been so vehemently relied upon by the counsel for the petitioner, we find that a discretion has been conferred upon the appointing authority to add period of five years or such other period as the appointing authority may decide in respect of an employee who opts for voluntary retirement for the purpose of computation of pension etc. It is with reference to this provision that an earlier Government Order dated 24.8.1977 was issued providing for addition of five years of service in the case of employees who opt for retirement, in the matter of pension but the position has changed thereafter. On recommendation of Sixth Pay Commission, and pay revision committee, the State of U.P. has also re-vised the benefit of pension, gratuity etc. payable to its

employees. The Government Order dated 8.12.2008 issued for the purpose under Clause 6 provides as follows:

"6. अर्हकारी से अतिरिक्त सेवा की गणना

उपरोक्त प्रस्तरों 1 से 5 में उल्लिखित पेंशन हेतु अर्हकारी सेवा की गणना व्यवस्था के परिप्रेक्ष्य में अतिरिक्त सेवा को पेंशन हेतु अर्हकारी सेवा में गणना की व्यवस्था समाप्त हो जाएगी तथा संबंधित नियम तदनुसार संशोधित समझा जाएगा।"

10. From simple reading of the Government Order, it is apparently clear that the State Government has decided to withdraw the earlier provision of adding five years of additional service for the purpose of computation of pension in the case of person who is retired/seeks voluntary retirement. It has also been provided that relevant Rule in that regard shall be deemed to have been amended accordingly.

11. So long as the Government Order dated 8.12.2008 stands on record, there could have been a direction in the order dated 27.2.2009 for providing addition of five years of service in the matter of computation of pension of the petitioner in terms of the Government Order dated 24.8.1977 (wrongly mentioned as 24.1.1977 in the order) inasmuch as on the date of issuance of order dated 27.2.2009, facility in that regard stood withdrawn by the Government Order dated 8.12.2008. This takes the Court to the 2nd issue namely the challenge made to the Government Order dated 8.12.2008 by means of the prayer No. 2 in the present writ petition.

12. The only ground pressed for challenging the Government Order is that it cannot have retrospective effect and cannot violate statutory provision of Rules 56 A. In our opinion, both the contentions raised on behalf of the petitioner are wholly misconceived. Neither the Govt order impugned has been given retrospective, in any case the issue has no bearing in the facts of this case as the petitioner had admittedly voluntarily retired in the year 2009 when the Government Order dated 8.12.2008 had already seen the light of the day.

13. So far as challenge on the ground of violation of statutory provision of funda-mental Rules' is concerned, we find that Rule 56 A (Da) proviso itself contemplates a power upon the appointing authority to issue orders for granting such benefit of additional period of service being added in the case of voluntary retirement of the em-ployees. It is with reference to this provi-sion that earlier Government Order dated 24.8.1977 had been issued. If by means of the subsequent Government Order, the facility has been withdrawn, it cannot be said that the State Government has acted contrary to the statutory provisions."

25. In view of the aforesaid, the instant petition is **disposed of** with the following directions:

(i) The respondents shall pay an amount of Rs. 1,55,231/- being the subsistence allowance for the period from 12.06.2000 to 22.08.2001 (suspension period of 437 days), which has already been determined to be paid to the petitioner by the Manager (Irrigation), Workshop Division, Allahabad, vide its later dated 16.05.2017 within a period of eight weeks from the date of production of certified copy of this order, if not already paid.

(ii) the respondents shall grant benefit of the five years additional service in terms of the Government Order dated 24.08.1977 to the petitioner from the date of acceptance of voluntary retirement i.e., 23.08.2001, for the purpose of calculation and payment of pensionary and other retiral dues and any amount so payable after calculation of the pensionary and retiral dues to the petitioner by granting five years service to the petitioner, the same shall also be paid within a period of eight weeks from the date of production of certified copy of this order.

(Anish Kumar Gupta,J.)

August 13, 2026
Shubham Arya