



2026:AHC:53606

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 3235 of 2026

Shyam Narayan

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

The Union Of India And 5 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Aadarsh Parashar, Abhishek Kumar Chaubey, Brijesh Kumar Singh, Deepak Singh Patel
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	A.S.G.I.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Abhishek Kumar Chaubey, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Saumitra Singh who appears for the respondents.
2. A preliminary objection has been raised by the learned counsel for the respondents that this Court may not have jurisdiction over the matter particularly when the punishment order came to be passed in Tamil Nadu, the appellate order in New Delhi and the said orders were served upon the writ petitioner in Sant Kabir Nagar, thus, this Court has territorial jurisdiction over the matter.
3. Sri Saumitra Singh, learned counsel for the respondent, on the other hand, submits that this Court may not have territorial jurisdiction particularly when no cause of action arises and merely because the writ petitioner is the resident of Sant Kabir Nagar would not clothe this Court with territorial jurisdiction.
4. I have heard the submission so made across the bar and perused the record.
5. Apparently, the writ petitioner happens to be the Member of RPSF, he was lastly posted in Tiruchirappalli, State of Tamil Nadu and the punishment order came to be passed in Tamil Nadu followed by appellant and revisional order in New Delhi, thus, this Court has no territorial jurisdiction. In **Rajendra Kumar Mishra Vs. Union of India (2005) 1 UPLBEC 108**. Interference is declined, the writ petition stands **disposed**

of for want of territorial jurisdiction with liberty to the writ petitioner to approach the Court having territorial jurisdiction over the matter.

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)

March 16, 2026
Rajesh