



2026:AHC:27392

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 18321 of 2025

Zulfiqar Ahmad Siddiqui

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of Up And 5 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Akshay Kumar Shukla, Ravindra Pal Singh Kashyap
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Akshay Kumar Shukla, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Jitendra Prasad, learned Standing Counsel for the State.
2. This Court entertained the writ petition on 04.12.2025 and sought instructions.
3. Today instructions have been produced before this Court under the signature of District Development Officer, Budaun dated 03.01.2026.
4. Sri Jitendra Prasad, learned Standing Counsel has made a statement at bar that he is possessed with the instructions and he is in a position to argue the matter and he does not propose to file any affidavit, the writ petition be decided on the basis of the documents available on record. With the consent of the parties, the writ petition is being decided at the fresh stage.
5. The case of the writ petitioner is that he was appointed as Assistant Urdu Translator on 02.03.1995 and he retired on 31.12.2024. However, an order came to be passed on 13.09.2025 by the District Development Officer re-fixing the pay of the writ petitioner and another order dated 10.09.2025 and the order dated 04.11.2025 of the District Development Officer seeking to recover an amount of Rs. 9,14,109/-.
6. Questioning the said order, the present writ petition has been preferred.
7. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner has sought to argue that the order impugned cannot be sustained particularly when though in the order dated 04.11.2025 reference has been made to an undertaking dated 09.10.2025 submitted by the writ petitioner but the said undertaking has no concern with the recovery which has been sought to be made post re-

fixation.

8. Learned Standing Counsel on the basis of the instructions so received submits that whatever might be the undertaking dated 09.10.2025 does not appear to be on the basis so as to accord justification to the respondents to recover the amount of Rs. 9,14,109/- according to him, a fresh exercise will be undertaken.

9. I have heard the submission so made across the bar and perused the record.

10. Apparently, the order impugned dated 04.11.2025 of the District Development Officer, Budaun talks about an undertaking dated 09.10.2025 directing the respondents to recover an amount of Rs. 9,14,109/-, however, as stated by Sri Jitendra Prasad submits that undertaking does not show that it is relatable to the amount sought to be recovered, thus, the writ petition is being decided in the following terms.-

the writ petitioner shall submit a comprehensive representation along with certified copy of the order before the District Development Officer, Budaun by 27.02.2026 and on the said motion the District Development Officer, Budaun shall issue a show cause notice to the writ petitioner by **20.03.2026** and thereafter, the writ petitioner shall respond to the same within 15 days and orders shall be passed within a period of six weeks, thereafter. The order dated 13.09.2025, 10.09.2025 and 04.11.2025 passed by District Development Officer, Budaun shall be subject to the further orders to be passed.

11. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands **disposed of**.

12. Instructions filed today are taken on record and marked as Appendix 'A'.

February 5, 2026
Rajesh

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)