



2026:AHC:9037

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 19667 of 2025

Raja Babu

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Manoj Kumar Patel
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Manoj Kumar Patel, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Jitendra Prasad, learned Standing Counsel for the State.

2. The case of the writ petitioner is that he is presently posted in Central Jail, Varanasi on the post of Deputy Jailor since 25.06.2025 as prior to it on 16.06.2025, he was promoted on the post of Deputy Jailor from Head Jailor and he was transferred to Varanasi on 24.06.2025. The writ petitioner on 26.06.2025 preferred an application for transferring him to Etawah where his wife is also working in the light of the guidelines dated 06.05.2025. Since the said application was not considered, the writ petitioner preferred Writ-A No. 12474 of 2025 which was disposed of on 26.08.2025 requiring the respondents to pass a speaking order consequent thereto, now the impugned order has been passed on 26.11.2025 by the Director General/ Inspector General, Jail Administration & Welfare Services, U.P., Lucknow.

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

4. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner has sought to argue that the order impugned cannot be sustained particularly that the Government Order clause 5(v) itself provides for transfer to the home district once the employee is to retire within a period of two years. Submission is that the claim of the writ petitioner has been rejected by a stroke of pen by considering the provisions of the transfer policy.

5. Learned Standing Counsel submits that as per the own saying of the

writ petitioner, the writ petitioner had preferred application seeking transfer on 26.06.2025 and as per clause 7 of the Transfer Policy dated 06.05.2025, the period of transfer for making application seeking transfer is from 15.05.2025 to 15.06.2025 since his application has been submitted subsequent to the cut of date, thus, the claim has not been considered. He submits that in the ensuing transfer policy, the claim of the writ petitioner would be considered.

6. To such a submission, learned counsel for the writ petitioner has no objection to the same.

7. Considering the submission so made across the bar, the writ petition stands **disposed of** leaving it open for the writ petitioner to again approach the respondents seeking benefit of being transferred to his home district when the next transfer policy comes into existence.

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)

January 14, 2026

Rajesh