



2026:AHC:22227

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 1654 of 2026

Princy Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Ram Prasad Dubey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Mahendra Narain Singh

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Ram Prasad Pandey, learned counsel for the writ petitioner, Sri V.K. Srivastava, learned Standing Counsel for the State and Sri Avanish Tripathi for the Commission.
2. Sri Avanish Tripathi, learned counsel for the Commission has produced before this Court the instructions which, according to him are self-contained. He does not propose to file any affidavit and the writ petition be decided on the basis of the documents available on record.
3. With the consent of the parties, the writ petition is being decided at the fresh stage.
4. The case of the writ petitioner is that an advertisement came to be published for recruitment on the post of R.O./A.R.O. Mains Examination 2025-26. It is also the case of the writ petitioner that the writ petitioner inadvertently applied in the category of General/DFF and he was issued an OTR No.812595968228. The writ petitioner at a later point of time on 25.07.2025 preferred an application/ request letter before the Secretary, U.P. Public Service Commission, Prayagraj for changing/ alteration of the category from General/ DFF to General. Thereafter, application form for main examination was filled up and the petitioner submitted her main examination form and category column she mentioned as General. However, on 14.01.2026, a notification came to be issued by the respondents, wherein the Roll Number of the writ petitioner being "0663076" found place at Sl. No.10, wherein the candidature of the writ petitioner has been cancelled due

to non-submission of the certificate of DFF along with general category. As per the notification dated 14.01.2016, the writ petitioner was accorded an opportunity to prefer an appeal by 20.01.2026 by 05:00 P.M. and the writ petitioner claims to have submitted an appeal on 16.01.2026, which came to be rejected on 23.01.2026 by the Deputy Secretary, U.P. Public Service Commission. The writ petitioner had earlier approached this Court while filing Writ-A No. 1150 of 2026, Princy Singh vs. State of U.P. and others, in which the following orders were passed: -

"1. Heard Sri Ram Prasad Dubey, learned counsel for the writ petitioner as well as Sri Manish Kumar, learned Standing Counsel for the State and Sri Avneesh Tripathi for the Commission.

2. Prayer in the present petition is to permit the writ petitioner to appear in RO/ARO Mains Examination-2026. According to the writ petitioner, there happens to be a discrepancy which had crept in attributable to the fact, the writ petitioner had shown himself General/DFF though the writ petitioner belongs to General Category. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner submits that the writ petitioner has preferred an appeal before the Secretary, U.P. Public Service Commission, second respondent on 16.01.2026 which is at page 28 of the paper book. He confines his relief for disposal of the appeal.

3. Sri Tripathi, counsel for the Commission, on the basis of the instructions dated 28.01.2026, submits that the appeal has been rejected and a hard copy of the order communicating the reasons has been furnished to the writ petitioner by 12:00 noon tomorrow i.e. 30.01.2026.

4. With the said observations, the writ petition stands disposed of.

5. Sri Ram Prasad Dubey shall give whatsapp number to the counsel for the Commission who shall communicate the order to his client.

6. Instructions filed today are taken on record. "

5. Questioning the appellate order dated 23.01.2026, the present petition has been filed.

6. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner has sought to argue that the order dated 23.01.2026 rejecting the appeal of the writ petitioner is non-speaking unreasoned and does not recite any reasons in coming to the conclusion. He submits that once a valuable right of appeal has been provided then the contentions so set forth in the appeal ought to have been considered and

thereafter order ought to have been passed. He submits that the said exercise is lacking.

7. Sri Tripathi, who appears for the Commission submits that the commission is occasioned with such a situation wherein thousands of appeals are being filed and it is not humanly possible to pass an order individually, as according to him, since it is the case of the writ petitioner that there was no additional ground which was worth consideration, thus the appeal stood decided along with the case of the other appellants. However, he gracefully submits that a speaking order would be passed in that regard.

8. I have heard the submissions so made across the Bar and perused the record.

9. Apparently, the appellate order dated 23.01.2026 is non-speaking and unreasoned. It does not even recite the case of the appellant, who is the writ petitioner before this Court. The appeal is a valuable right and the appeal cannot be rejected as a matter of routine, particularly when the contentions so set forth in the memo of appeal are liable to be considered. Since the appellate order does not recite the case of the appellant/ writ petitioner and the same has been passed without assigning any reason, thus the order impugned cannot be sustained.

10. At this juncture Sri Tripathi, who appears for the Commission submits that appellate order will be passed today by 04:00 O'Clock and the copy of the order will be sent to the writ petitioner through post and on whatsapp on the number which is registered with the Commission.,

11. Accordingly, the order dated 23.01.2026 passed by the appellate authority is set aside. Matter stands remitted back to the authority to pass a fresh order by today itself.

12. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition stands **disposed of**.

February 2, 2026

N.S.Rathour

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)