



2026:AHC:8445

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 19407 of 2025

Vijayi Pal

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of Uttar Pradesh And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Amit Kumar Satsangi, Rishabh Kumar
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Rishabh Kumar, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Prashant Kumar Mishra, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State.

2. The case of the writ petitioner is that he was appointed on 08.02.2008 on the post of Class-IV employee (Sweeper), however, now by virtue of the order dated 21.11.2025 he has been placed under suspension by fifth respondent, Commandant, 48th I.R. Battalion, Sonbhadra with an allegation that the writ petitioner on 21.11.2025 when there was an inspection by the higher officials, it was found that the washroom and certain other places were not clean.

3. Questioning the said suspension order, the present writ petition has been preferred.

4. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner submits that the suspension order cannot be sustained particularly when first of all the writ petitioner has not committed misconduct secondly, mere non cleanliness of washroom and certain places cannot be a ground to impose suspension particularly when once the allegations are taken into face value only minor punishment can be imposed. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner submits that he shall participate and cooperate in the inquiry.

5. Learned Standing Counsel submits that the writ petitioner is habitual in committing misconduct at earlier point of time he had entered into the bedroom of some officer and secondly it is his duty to maintain

cleanliness.

6. I have heard the submission so made across the bar and perused the record.

7. Facts are not in issue. It is not in issue that the writ petitioner's services were governed under the U.P. Police Officers of Subordinate Ranks (Punishment and Appeal) Rules, 1991. It has also not in dispute that the writ petitioner was suspended on 21.11.2025. It is not in dispute that the allegations so contained in the order impugned are relatable to an incident dated 21.11.2025 when the washroom and certain other places were not found to be clean. On a pointed query being raised to Sri Prashant Mishra, learned Standing Counsel whether major punishment can be imposed, the answer is in negative. Apart from the allegation of barging into the bedroom is not a ground for placing the writ petitioner under suspension.

8. Prima facie, the Court is of the opinion that continuous suspension is not warranted.

9. Accordingly, the writ petition is being decided in the following terms.-

(a) the order dated 21.11.2025, passed by the Fourth respondent, Deputy Inspector General of Police, PAC, Range, Mirzapur suspending the writ petitioner is quashed; (b) it would be open for the disciplinary authority to get concluded proceedings inquiry within a period of three months.

10. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed of.

11. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner, as per instructions received from his client submits that he shall participate.

12. Instructions filed today are taken on record and marked as Appendix 'A'.

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)

January 13, 2026
Rajesh