



2026:AHC:15966

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 673 of 2026

Smt. Santosh Srivastava

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Upendra Kumar Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Upendra Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Rahul Malviya, learned Standing Counsel for the State.
2. The case of the writ petitioner is that she is the widow of Late Narendra Kumar Srivastava who was working Forest Authority against him an order came to be passed dispensing with the services in the year 2011 which was subject matter of challenge in Writ-A No. 27380 of 2011, however, the said writ petition was dismissed with liberty to approach the U.P. Public Service Tribunal. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner submits that the husband of the writ petitioner has not preferred any proceedings before the tribunal. The husband of the writ petitioner has also expired. The writ petitioner since payment of salary for the period when her husband had worked and also other benefits.
3. Learned Standing Counsel submits that there happens to be an order dated 05.02.2025 passed by Samajik Vaniki Prabhag Azamgarh on the ground that the writ petitioner is not entitled to any benefit in that regard.
4. I have heard the submission so made across the bar and perused the record.
5. Facts are in issue. It is not in dispute that the husband of the writ petitioner was confronted with a order of dismissal in the year 2011, he though approached this Court but the Court dismissed the petition requiring the original writ petitioner to approach the Public Service

Tribunal. A statement has been made by learned counsel for the writ petitioner that the husband of the writ petitioner has not approached the tribunal. Since this is the factual and legal position, thus, the writ petitioner would not be entitled for pensionary benefits, however, with relation to the payment of salary for the actual days when he happened to be worked or subsistence allowance, the same is required to be considered by the fourth respondent, Director of Samajik Vaniki Prabhag Azamgarh.

6. Considering the submission so made across the bar, the writ petition stands **disposed of** directing the writ petitioner to submit a comprehensive representation along with self attested copy of the writ petition and certified copy of the order before the fourth respondent, Director of Samajik Vaniki Prabhag Azamgarh by **05.02.2026**. Thereafter, the fourth respondent shall decide the claim of the writ petitioner within a period of three month.

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)

January 21, 2026

Rajesh