



2026:AHC:36502

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 2165 of 2026

Sadhna Kumari

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Ajay Mishra, Ritesh Kumar, Sr. Advocate
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Krishna Mishra, Sr. Advocate assisted by Shri Kumar Prajjwal (A/K 2174/2025) holding brief of Shri Ajay Mishra, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Gaurav Singh, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel, who appears for State-respondents.

2. This court entertained this petition on 13.02.2026 while directing the learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel to obtain instructions and thereafter the matter was fixed for today. Instructions have been supplied by Sri Gaurav Singh, learned Standing Counsel, submits that he is well equipped with the instructions and the instructions are self-sufficient for disposal of the writ petition and he does not propose to file any further affidavit and the petition be decided on the basis of the documents available on record, 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 though the writ petitioner was posted as Mukhya Sevika, however, she came to be promoted on the post of Child Development Project Officer on 04.10.2025. However, on 26.12.2025, she came to be suspended under the orders passed by the Director, Directorate of Child Development Services and Nutrition, U.P. Government, Lucknow.

4. Questioning the suspension order, the writ petitioner has been filed the present writ petition.

5. Post passing of the order, today instructions have been forwarded under the signature of District Program Officer, Auraiya, dated 18.02.2026 which

is taken on record and marked as Appendix A.

6. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner has submitted that the entire allegations so levelled upon the writ petitioner which became the subject matter of suspension is not relatable to the writ petitioner for the simple reason that the writ petitioner came to be promoted from the post of Mukhya Sevika to the post of Child Development Project Officer on 04.10.2025, however, the allegations are somewhat rooted for the period prior to his posting as Child Development Project Officer. Submission is that the writ petitioner was at no point of time given inventory and details and about the raw material of the mid day meal which was kept in the godown as the allegation of the writ petitioner is that the Mukhya Sevika being Smt. Vimlesh Kumari, Smt. Anupama Srivastava and the office clerk are responsible for the same. Submission is that the writ petitioner's post taking the charge had taken a possible steps of disturbing the food-grains relatable to the mid day meal to the students in this regard. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner submits that though the notice came to be issued to the writ petitioner on 03.12.2025 but the writ petitioner has amply demonstrated that the writ petitioner has been illegally suspended. Learned Senior Counsel submits that for the revocation of the suspension, the writ petitioner has already represented her cause before the respondent no. 2 being the appointing authority but no orders have been passed till date.

7. He thus confines his prayer for disposal of the applications submitted by the writ petitioner before respondent no. 2 on 30.12.2025 for revocation of the suspension order.

8. Learned Standing Counsel on the other hand submits that the charges are self-clear and the writ petitioner has been placed under suspension after considering each and every aspect of the matter by authority who is competent to suspend the writ petitioner. Submission is that the writ petitioner happened to be Mukhya Sevika and from there, she came to be promoted and there is no change in the centre in this regard. However, he submits that it is always open for the writ petitioner to insist for revocation of the writ petitioner and in case the writ petitioner has represented her cause then the same shall be considered strictly in accordance with law.

9. Considering the submissions of the rival parties, bearing in mind the overall facts situation, since learned Senior Counsel as per the instructions

submits that he seeks to approach the respondent no. 2 for revocation of the suspension thus in the fitness of the matter without delving further into the issues, the writ petition is being **disposed off** requiring the second respondent to consider the claim of the writ petitioner for revocation of the suspension, proceed to decide the claim of the petitioner strictly in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from the date of presentation of the certified copy of the order.

10. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition is **disposed off**.

February 18, 2026

Ashu

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)