



2026:AHC:6041

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 19325 of 2025

Ramlakhan

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Dharmendra Kumar Singh, Ram Shyam Shanker Pandey, Subodh Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Ram Shyam Shanker, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Anup Kumar, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State.
2. The case of the writ petitioner is that he was engaged as a Daily Wager, Class IV employee (Watcher-Animal Protector) in 2006 and the claim is that he is continuously working without there being any break to the utmost satisfaction of the superior, however, the writ petitioner has not been assigned and made entitle to minimum of pay scale and in this regard he has preferred a representation on 20.02.2025 before the Divisional Director, Social Forestry, Forest Department, Mainpuri but no decision has been made.
3. Prayer in the present petition is to accord minimum of the pay scale to the writ petitioner.
4. Learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel, on the other hand, submits that whatever might be the question which would arise would be whether the writ petitioner is already working and his entitlement are the questions at the first instance are to be examined by the third respondent, Divisional Director, Social Forestry, Forest Department, Mainpuri, thus, according to him, the writ petitioner may approach the said authority.
5. To such a submission, learned counsel for the writ petitioner has no objection to the same.

6. Considering the submissions so made across the bar, the writ petition stands **disposed of** directing the writ petitioner to prefer a comprehensive representation along with the self attested copy of the writ petition before the third respondent by **22.01.2026**. On the said motion, the third respondent shall examine the entitlement and the claim the writ petitioner and proceed to pass order within a period of two months therefrom and, in case, the writ petitioner is entitled to the said benefits in the light of the judgment in **Writ Petition No. 12358 of 2019 (Ram Naresh and otehrs Vs. State of U.P.)**, **Writ Petition No. 18119 of 2019 (Ram Autar Vs. State of U.P. & others)**, **Writ Petition No. 18693 of 2020 (Mohd. Saheem Vs. State of U.P. & others)**, **Writ Petition No. 2844 of 2023 (Suresh Vs. State of U.P. & others)** then the said benefits be accorded to the writ petitioner in accordance with law with most expedition.

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)

January 9, 2026

Rajesh