



2026:AHC-LKO:16709-DB

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - A No. - 2464 of 2026

Siya Ram Verma (Pno-012120114)

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Prin. Secy./Addl. Chief Secy. Deptt. Of Home
U.P. Lko.By State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Ravi Singh, Nischay Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 1

HON'BLE RAJAN ROY, J.

HON'BLE ABDHESH KUMAR CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Heard.

2. By means of this writ petition the petitioner has challenged the judgment and order dated 11.12.2025 passed in Claim Petition No.723 of 2025.

3. The petitioner was visited with the minor punishment of censure. Prior to imposing punishment of censure, he has been placed under suspension and the salary for the suspension period was also forfeited.

4. The said order dated 06.08.2024 was challenged by the petitioner before the U.P. Public Services Tribunal in Claim Petition No.723 of 2025.

5. The Tribunal has accepted the claim of the petitioner for being provided remaining salary for the period of suspension, rightly so, as the proceedings were for imposition of minor punishment and not major punishment and ultimately the punishment imposed was also minor, therefore, there was no occasion to suspend the petitioner. However, the Tribunal has rejected the claim petition so far challenge to the censure entry is concerned. It is against this part of the judgment that this writ petition has been filed by the

petitioner.

6. The contention of the petitioner's counsel is that time was sought by the petitioner for submitting reply to the show-cause notice dated 20.05.2024, twice, but the same was not granted and the impugned order of punishment was passed.

7. Learned counsel for the State submits that on 20.05.2024 a show-cause notice was issued to the petitioner as to why the censure entry proposed should not be awarded to him, giving 15 days time to the petitioner for filing his reply, which was sufficient. However, instead of filing reply, on 24.06.2024, he sought 30 days further time whereupon 10 days further time was granted to the petitioner, but he did not do so, instead on 29.06.2024, 10 days' further was sought by the petitioner which was also granted to him in spite of it, the reply was not submitted.

8. The submission of learned Standing Counsel was that in fact the order of punishment was passed only on 06.08.2024 but in spite of it, the petitioner did not submit any reply, therefore, there is no violation of principles of natural justice.

9. We find merit in the submission advanced by the learned Standing Counsel.

10. 15 days time granted in the show cause notice itself was sufficient for submitting such a reply, but in any case, twice 10 days' further time was granted to the petitioner, meaning thereby 20 days' further time was granted to the petitioner, a total of 45 days but he did not submit his reply. In any case, the order of punishment having been passed on 06.08.2024 at least the petitioner should have shown his bona fide by filing the reply prior to passing of the punishment order, but no such reply was filed. In these circumstances, it cannot be said that there is violation of principles of natural justice. The factual issues cannot be interfered by the writ-Court.

11. We do not find any error in the impugned judgment of the

Tribunal.

12. *Dismissed.*

(Abdhesh Kumar Chaudhary,J.) (Rajan Roy,J.)

February 27, 2026
MVS/-