



2026:AHC:4964

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 16373 of 2025

Dr. Umesh Chand Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Akhilesh Kumar Tiwari, Krishnanand, Santosh Kumar Tiwari, Virendra Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

Order on Civil Misc. Impleadment Application No. 4 of 2025

1. Since there is no objection to the same by the learned Standing Counsel, amendment application stands allowed.
2. Accordingly, impleadment application is allowed.
3. Let necessary impleadment be carried out in the writ petition by learned counsel for petitioner during the course of the day.

Order on Petition

1. Heard Sri Virendra Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner and Ms. Archana Tyagi, learned Addl. Chief Standing Counsel, who appears for State-respondents.
2. Instructions have been supplied by Ms. Archana Tyagi, learned Additional Chief learned Standing Counsel, submits that she is well equipped with the instructions and the instructions are self-sufficient for disposal of the writ petition and she does not propose to file any further affidavit and the petition be decided on the basis of the documents available on record, thus with the consent of the parties, writ petition is being decided at the fresh stage.
3. The case of the writ petitioner is that the writ petitioner is presently posted as Superintendent, Community Health Centre, Nichlaul, District Maharajganj. However, now by virtue of an order dated 23.09.2025 on the basis of a complaint of the one of the member of the ruling party, one Dr.

Ishwarchand Vidyasagar has been given an additional charge in that regard on the post which the writ petitioner was manning on 23.09.2025.

4. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner submits that the same is not in accordance with law, particularly, when the writ petitioner is an awardee and on account of an anguish of the member of the ruling party, he has been dislodged an additional charge which has been given. He submits that the writ petitioner has been given award and this work is exemplary and there ought to have been a procedure adopted by the respondents while putting the writ petitioner to notice and the order could not have been passed behind the back of the writ petitioner. It is also submitted that the order impugned has been passed just in order to accommodate Dr. Ishwarchand Vidyasagar.

5. Learned Standing Counsel submits that the claim of the writ petitioner needs adjudication at the first instance by the Director General, Health and Family Welfare, Lucknow, second respondent.

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

7. In the opinion of the Court that since issues are being raised which are somewhat bounding factual arena thus it is for the Director General, Health and Family Welfare, Lucknow to take a call.

8. 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 by 16.01.2026, proceed to decide the claim of the petitioner and summon the records and examine the entire case strictly in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from the date of presentation of the certified copy of the order.

9. The grant of additional charge to Dr. Ishwarchand Vidyasagar shall be subject to be final orders would be passed.

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

January 8, 2026

A. Prajapati

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)