



2026:AHC:10339

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 363 of 2026

Kunji Lal

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Ashok Kumar Pandey, Harindra Prasad
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Harindra Prasad, 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 while the writ petitioner was posted as Lekhpal, he was placed under suspension by District Magistrate, Azamgarh on 28.04.2025 while directing for holding of inquiry.
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 writ petitioner is a Lakhpal only and he had at no point of time issued any certificate and the alleged inquiry *ex parte* which became the basis for suspension. He further submits that only minor punishment can be imposed.
5. Learned Standing Counsel submits that the suspension order has been passed wayback on 28.04.2025 and charge sheet has been issued on 17.06.2025 to which the writ petitioner has rendered his reply on 01.07.2025. He submits that the materials available before the Disciplinary Authority which became the basis for suspending the writ petitioner.
6. I have heard the submission so made across the bar and perused the record.
7. Apparently, it is not the case of the writ petitioner that he has been

placed under suspension by the authority who is competent to suspend. Furthermore, the Court finds that the suspension order has been passed on 28.04.2025, a charge sheet came to be issued on 17.06.2025 and reply was submitted by the writ petitioner on 01.07.2025. The allegations contained in the suspension order as well as the charge sheet is relatable to committing of misconduct and irregularity in issuance of the caste certificate. In the opinion of the Court, it would not be appropriate to delve into the merits of the charges as they are subject to departmental proceedings.

8. Accordingly, interference is declined, the writ petition stands **disposed of**. Since the writ petitioner has submitted his reply to the charge sheet, the inquiry proceedings be concluded within a period of three months. The writ petitioner has also been paid subsistence allowance which subject to fulfillment of the requirement. As regards, the submissions that minor punishment can only be is concerned, it is not appropriate for the Court to usurp the jurisdiction of the disciplinary authority.

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)

January 16, 2026

Rajesh