



2026:AHC:22845

## HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 1458 of 2026

Santosh Kumar

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 5 Others

.....Respondent(s)

---

|                           |                                                        |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| Counsel for Petitioner(s) | : Girish Chandra Maurya, Om Prakash,<br>Saurabh Pratap |
| Counsel for Respondent(s) | : C.S.C.                                               |

---

**Court No. - 33**

**HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.**

1. Heard Sri Girish Chandra Maurya, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Piyush Shukla, learned Standing Counsel for the State.
2. The case of the writ petitioner is that the writ petitioner was appointed as Gram Panchayat Adhikari on 10.10.2018, however, the writ petitioner claims to have been transferred from Development Khand Manihari to Karanda, District Ghazipur.
3. Questioning the said transfer order, the writ petitioner has preferred Writ-A No. 17789 of 2025 which came to be disposed of on 27.11.2025 requiring the writ petitioner which was considered by virtue of the order dated 14.01.2026 by the District Development Officer, Ghazipur. Questioning the order negating the claim of the writ petitioner, the present writ petition has been preferred.
4. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner has sought to argue that the order impugned cannot be sustained even for a single moment particularly when the impugned transfer order is punitive in nature and the same has been passed on the basis of certain complaints. Further submission is that, in case, there was anything adverse against the writ petitioner then the writ petitioner ought to have been departmentally proceeded with.
5. Learned Standing Counsel, on the other hand, submits that transfer has been made in public interest and there is no question of any complaint in that regard.

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

7. Facts are not in issue. It is not in dispute that the writ petitioner was appointed on the post of Village Development Officer on 10.10.2018 and thereafter, on 15.12.2023, he was transferred from Development Block Birno to Bhagoda and thereafter post recommendation, a member of ruling party, the same was modified to Manihari and from Manihari, the writ petitioner came to be transferred on 25.09.2025 to Kharanda. In the opinion of the Court, there exist consideration of the respondents while transferring the writ petitioner and the transfer order does not show that it is punitive in nature though there might be something adverse against the writ petitioner. Be that as it may, only the writ petitioner has been transferred from one block to another block and, thus, this Court does not find the present case to be a fit case for interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

8. Accordingly, the writ petition is **rejected**.

**(Vikas Budhwar,J.)**

**February 3, 2026**  
Rajesh