



2026:AHC:15127

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 726 of 2026

Raghuraj Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Amit Goel, Arun Kumar Goyal, Rakesh Kumar Gupta
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Rakesh Kumar Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Pramod Kumar Srivastava, learned Addl. Chief Standing Counsel, who appears for State-respondents.

2. The case of the writ petitioner is that he was appointed as Constable on 01.05.1982 and promoted as Head Constable in the year 2014 and stood retired from the post of Sub Inspector on 31.05.2023. However, by virtue of the order passed in the Month of May, 2024 by the third respondent, Superintendent of Police, Firozabad, now there has been re-fixation of salary and consequential recovery from the pay scale of Rs. 64,100/- to 60,400/-. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that it is not a case of fraud or concealment, and further, the entire action is unilateral and behind the back of the petitioners.

3. Prayer in the present petition is for a direction to the respondents to consider the claim.

4. Learned Addl. Chief Standing Counsel submits that the claim of the writ petitioner needs adjudication at the first instance by the third respondent, Superintendent of Police, Firozabad.

5. To such a submission, learned counsel for the petitioner has no objection and he gracefully accepts the same.

6. Considering the submissions of the rival parties as well as stand taken by them, the writ petition is being **disposed off** granting liberty to the writ petitioner to prefer a comprehensive representation along with the self-

attested copy of the writ petition before the third respondent, who shall on the receipt of the same within a period of two weeks, proceed to decide the claim of the petitioner strictly in accordance with law within a period of three months from the date of presentation of the certified copy of the order. In case the third respondent is of the opinion that the matter is to be decided by some other authorities then the papers shall be transmitted to the same.

7. Till the decision/ fresh orders are passed by the authorities, no coercive action shall be taken against the writ petitioner.

8. The protection so accorded to the writ petitioner shall remain applicable only in those contingencies wherein the writ petitioner stick to the timeline and does not violate any terms and conditions of the order and, in case, there has been any violation the protection so accorded shall stand vacated without reference to the Bench.

9. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition is **disposed off**.

January 21, 2026

A. Prajapati

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)