



2026:AHC:31288-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 2097 of 2026

Kalu Ram Meena and 15 others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

The Union of India and 5 others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Kamlesh Kumar Yadav
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	S.P. Singh, A.S.G.I., Jigyasa Singh

Chief Justice's Court

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

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioners aggrieved of the order dated 03.09.2025 passed by the Central Administrative Tribunal, Allahabad Bench, Allahabad. The Original Application ('OA') was filed seeking to question the validity of order dated 01.05.2024 and a direction to the respondents to finalize the selection process of the applicants issued for induction of Track Maintainer IV into other departments against 10% lateral intake quota *vide* notification dated 06.09.2019.

2. Submissions have been made that notification for induction of Track Maintainer IV into other departments against 10% lateral vacancy was issued wherein total 69 posts were indicated though the petitioners applied for the same and are eligible for transfer, the respondents have chosen not to transfer the petitioners. The representations made in this regard have been wrongly rejected.

3. Before the Tribunal, on behalf of the respondents, submissions were made that in the cadre of Track Maintainer IV Level 1, there are huge vacancies and the ACS- 285 of IREM Volume-1 provides that the lateral transfer will be undertaken as and when direct recruitment exercise is completed and till such time that the vacancies in the cadre of Track Maintainer IV are not filled up, the lateral transfer cannot take place.

4. The Tribunal, after hearing the parties, came to the conclusion that ACS-285 has to be followed, the factual position regarding the vacancy in the cadre of Track Maintainer IV has not been denied and the lateral

transfer cannot be claimed as a matter of right and, consequently, dismissed the OA.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners attempted to make submissions that the Tribunal was not justified in dismissing the OA, inasmuch as, there are vacancies available at the place of lateral transfer and that despite issuance of notification dated 06.09.2019, indicating 69 vacancies, the needful has not been done.

6. Attempt was made to submit that in other Railways, despite the vacancy in the cadre of Track Maintainer IV, the lateral transfer has been permitted.

7. Having gone through the record of the petition, it is apparent that the respondents have taken the consistent plea of there being huge vacancy in the cadre of Track Maintainer IV and has denied the lateral transfer though the notification dated 06.09.2019 providing for such lateral transfer was issued.

8. Once it is an admitted fact that there are vacancies in the cadre of Track Maintainer IV, the respondents are not expected to transfer the Track Maintainers laterally to other departments so as to increase the vacancy in the cadre. The plea raised pertaining to the other Railways, is not supported by any material worth the name.

9. In that view of the matter, we do not find any reason to interfere with the order passed by the Tribunal. There is no substance in the petition, the same is, therefore, **dismissed**.

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

February 12, 2026

Sandeep//Jyotsana