



2026:AHC:22346

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 7435 of 2024

Ravendar Singh Dhenua

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Abhay Kumar Singh, Anil Kumar Srivastava, Gyanendra Tripathi
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Anil Kumar Srivastava, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Pramod Kumar Srivastava, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel, who appears for State-respondents.
2. The counsel for the rival parties have made a joint statement that they do not propose to file any further affidavits thus with the consent of the parties, writ petition is being decided at the fresh stage.
3. The case of the writ petitioner is that the writ petitioner was engaged as computer operator on contractual basis on 04.04.2017 under a scheme by the name and style of 'MGNREGA'. According to the writ petitioner, a show cause notice came to be issued on 30.03.2024 show causing the writ petitioner as to why adverse action be not taken against the writ petitioner by the Block Development Officer, Noujheel, Mathura to which the writ petitioner claims to have tendered his reply on 06.04.2024, however, now by virtue of the order dated 30.04.2024 passed by the Block Development Officer, Noujheel, Mathura, the services of the writ petitioner has been disposed with.
4. Questioning the same, the writ petitioner has been filed the present writ petition.
5. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner has submitted that the order impugned cannot be sustained even for a single moment, particularly, when though show cause notice came to be issued which was replied by the writ petitioner but there is no consideration about the contentions sought to be

raised and they have not been taken note of also. Submission is that a show cause notice had issued and the reply was submitted and the author of the order is under legal obligation to deal with each and every aspect of the matter.

6. Learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel on the other hand submits that the order in question does not deal with the contentions so sought to be raised, according to him, the order be set aside and the matter be remitted back to authority to pass fresh orders.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the records carefully.

8. Facts are not in issue. It is not in issue that the writ petitioner is a contractual employee, working as computer operator, however, a show cause notice came to be issued on 30.03.2024 which was replied by the writ petitioner on 06.04.2024 and the order impugned came to be passed on 30.04.2024 without recording any reason in coming to the conclusion and even there is no notice of contentions so raised by the writ petitioner. Since the order impugned is completely silent about the contentions raised and there is no consideration thus the order impugned cannot be sustained.

9. Accordingly, the writ petition is being decided in the following manner:

(a). The impugned order dated 30.04.2024 passed by the respondent no.2, Block Development Officer, Noujheel, Mathura is set aside.

(b). The matter stands remitted back to pass fresh order strictly in accordance with law within a period of three months from the date of presentation of the certified copy of the order.

10. The quashing of the order would not automatically give a right to the writ petitioner for reinstatement as the same will be subject to further orders to be passed in that regard.

11. Accordingly, the writ petition stands **disposed of**.

February 2, 2026
Ashu

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)