



2026:AHC:15963

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 19646 of 2025

Ravindra Kumar Asthana

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Neeraj Kumar Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Ashish Mishra

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Neeraj Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the writ petitioner, Sri Rahul Malviya, learned Standing Counsel for the State as well as Sri Chandan Sharma as well as Sri Rahul Malviya, learned Standing Counsels for the State.

2. Sri Chandan Sharma, learned Standing Counsel has made a statement that he is well equipped with the instructions and is in a position to argue the case. He does not propose to file any counter affidavit and he further submits that the writ petition be decided on the basis of the documents available on record.

3. With the consent of the parties, the writ petition is being decided at the fresh stage.

4. The case of the writ petitioner is that he was appointed as a Clerk on 02.07.1975 and on 30.11.2012, he was superannuated. According to the writ petitioner, two inquiries were conducted against the writ petitioner; one in the year 1984 and another in 1988. Order came to be passed by on 22.03.2013 for recovery of 20% of pension and another order came to be passed on 03.04.2013 for reduction of 20% of pension. Both the orders were subject matter of appeal before the Administrative Judge. The same came to be allowed on 27.02.2015 and 18.03.2015. According to the writ petitioner, the writ petitioner is not being paid pension, as per his status and last pay drawn.

5. Sri Chandan Sharma, learned Standing Counsel submits that the appellate orders passed by the Administrative Judge were based upon the fact that post

retirement, inquiry cannot be conducted and the only provision, which would apply is the Article 351(A) of the Civil Services Regulation. For the said purpose the matter is before the appropriate authority for according sanction. He submits that the claim of the writ petitioner would be decided within a period of six weeks.

6. Considering the submissions so made across the Bar, the writ petition stands **disposed of** directing the writ petitioner to prefer a comprehensive representation along with self attested copy of the writ petition and the certified copy of the order before Respondent no.4, who on the said motion shall proceed to consider the claim of the writ petitioner strictly in accordance with law within a period of six weeks, from the date of production of certified copy of the order.

January 22, 2026

N.S.Rathour

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)