



2026:AHC:41260-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 2670 of 2026

Ram Raksha and another

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and 5 others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Kirti Kumar Singh, Pyare Lal Yadav
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: A.S.G.I., Shiv Kumar Pal, Dy.S.G.I.

Chief Justice's Court

HON'BLE ARUN BHANSALI, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE KSHITIJ SHAILENDRA, J.

1. This petition is directed against order dated 05.12.2024 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Allahabad Bench, Allahabad whereby the Original Application filed by the petitioners has been dismissed.
2. The petitioners approached the Tribunal aggrieved of the action of the respondents in not according appointment under LARSGESS Scheme in terms of the directions issued by this Court.
3. The respondents on account of the fact that scheme was withdrawn and Hon'ble Supreme Court had directed closing of all the pending cases, rejected the prayer.
4. The Tribunal after quoting the order passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Manjit and others v. Union of India and another*** [Writ Petition (Civil) No. 78 of 2021, decided on 29th January, 2021], wherein the Supreme Court had observed that the petitioners can claim neither a vested right nor a legitimate expectation under such a scheme and ordered that all claims based on the scheme must now be closed, dismissed the Original Application.
5. Counsel for the petitioners attempted to make submissions that the application was made well before the scheme came to an end and that

despite the order passed by the Tribunal, non-consideration by the respondents is not justified.

6. Learned counsel for the respondents supported the order impugned. Submissions have been made that once Hon'ble Supreme Court has ordered for closing of all the claims based on the scheme, irrespective of the point of time when the application was made, the claim cannot be considered.

7. We have considered the submissions made by counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

8. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Manjit (Supra)** *inter-alia* observed as under :

"Noticing the above decision, this Court, in its order dated 6 March 2019, specifically observed that since the Scheme stands terminated and is no longer in existence, nothing further need be done in the matter. The Scheme provided for an avenue of a back door entry into the service of the railways. This would be fundamentally at odds with Article 16 of the Constitution. The Union Government has with justification discontinued the scheme. The petitioners can claim neither a vested right nor a legitimate expectation under such a Scheme. All claims based on the Scheme must now be closed."

9. Hon'ble Supreme Court has clearly opined and directed that the Union of India had a justification to discontinue the scheme, petitioners therein could neither claim any vested right or legitimate expectation under the Scheme and specifically ordered that all claims based on the scheme must now be closed.

10. The said observations were reiterated by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **The Chief Personnel Officer and others v. A. Nishanth George : 2022 INSC 92**.

11. In view of the categorical directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the action of the respondents cannot be faulted.

12. In view of above, no case for interference is made out in the petition.

The same is, therefore, **dismissed**.

February 24, 2026
nd

(Kshitij Shailendra, J) (Arun Bhansali, CJ)