



2026:AHC:10298

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 336 of 2026

Santosh Kumar And 39 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Narendra Mohan, Shree Prakash Upadhyay
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Shri Narendra Mohan, learned counsel for the petitioners has made a statement at bar that he seeks dismissal of the writ petition on behalf of the writ petitioner no. 37.
2. Heard Sri S.K. Upadhyay, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Gaurav Singh, learned Standing Counsel for the State.
3. The counsel for the rival parties have made a joint statement that they do not propose to file any further affidavits thus with the consent of the parties, writ petition is being decided at the fresh stage.
4. The case of the writ petitioners is that they have applied for the post of Safai Karmies in pursuance of advertisement issued in the year 2008 and they claim to have been selected, however, on 01.07.2025, the District Magistrate, Bhadohi had issued a letter to the Principal Secretary Panchayat Raj regarding the deployment of Safai Karmis in District Bhadohi. The Director Panchayat Raj, U.P. Lucknow has also sent letter to Regional Deputy Director Panchayat Raj on 25.08.2025 regarding meeting pursuant to the appointment of Safai Karmis in District Bhadohi. It is also the case of the writ petitioners, the respondent no. 2 has sent a letter to the respondent no. 1 with regard to the appointment of Safai Karmis on 05.08.2025 and the Director of Panchayat Raj, Lucknow issued an order/ directive letter dated 18.09.2025 to District Panchayatiraj Officers to the various Districts. According to the writ petitioners, the communication dated 18.09.2025 itself is illegal, particularly, when there happens to be various posts while lying

vacant in Bhadohi against which the writ petitioners can be accorded joining but now the said post is being sought to be adjusted in other Districts. Learned counsel for the writ petitioners submits that he confines his prayer for disposal of the representation with the writ petitioner as preferred on 15.11.2025 before the District Magistrate.

5. Learned Standing Counsel submits that be that as it may be, it is always open for the writ petitioner to approach the District Magistrate, Bhadohi.

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 third 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 third 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 of.

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)

January 16, 2026
Rajesh