



2026:AHC:16869

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 13167 of 2024

Ravindra Kumar Srivastava

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Anup Shukla, Devansh Misra
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Anup Shukla holding brief of Shri Devansh Misra, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri B.K. Srivastava, learned Standing Counsel, who appears for State-respondents.

2. The case of the writ petitioner is that he was appointed on the post of Routine Grade Clerk on 20.11.1994 w.e.f. 18.07.1992 thereafter he was promoted on the post of Lower Division Assistant on 13.12.1994 and he was placed under suspension on 10.03.2005 and the suspension order would be revoked on 12.06.2006, a seniority list came to be published of the Assistant Review Officer on 02.03.2012 in which the name of the writ petitioner finds place at serial no. 2 in the list of Assistant Review Officer. According to the writ petitioner, disciplinary proceedings so initiated against the writ petitioner was dropped on 19.11.2012, however, in the interregnum period on 05.11.2014, the ACP came into operation w.e.f. 01.12.2008 bifurcating the same upon completion of 10 years of satisfactory service, 16 years of satisfactory service and 26 years of satisfactory service.

3. The grievance of the writ petitioner is that the writ petitioner has not been granted 3rd APC with grade pay of Rs. 6600/- Level-11 pursuant to the Government order dated 05.11.2014.

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

4. Learned Standing Counsel submits that the claim of the writ petitioner needs adjudication at the first instance by the second respondent, Advocate General, Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow.

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 second 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 two months from the date of presentation of the certified copy of the order. In case the second 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. Needless to point out that the writ petition has been decided without seeking any response from the respondents. Thus, passing of this order may not be construed to an expression that this Court has gone into the merits of the case.

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

January 22, 2026

A. Prajapati

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)