



2026:AHC:36302

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 2268 of 2026

Kumkum Rai

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Chandra Kumar Rai
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Supplementary affidavit filed today is taken on record.
2. Heard Sri Chandra Kumar Rai, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri R.S. Umrao, learned Standing Counsel, who appears for State-respondents.
3. Instructions have been supplied by Sri R.S. Umrao, learned Additional Chief 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.
4. The case of the writ petitioner is that the writ petitioner is the resident of Village Sondsar, Post Faijullahpur, Block Kopaganj, District Mau and he was appointed as Bank Sakhi at Union Bank of India, Branch Kurthi Jafarpur, Kopaganj, District Mau. However, according to the writ petitioner on 03.12.2024, a notice shall be issued to the writ petitioner alleging irregularities committed by the writ petitioner not functioning by the Block Development Officer, Kopaganj, Mau. The same was followed by a notice dated 07.12.2024 of *Udhan Prerana Sankul Stariya*, Block Kopaganj, Mau. The writ petitioner claims to have submitted a reply to the same on 12.12.2024 through registered post Annexure-4 at page 27 which seems to be acknowledged by virtue of a document dated 22.01.2021 of the respondents at page 31 and thereafter the order impugned dated 07.02.2026 came to be passed discharging the writ petitioner from engagement by Deputy Commissioner, Self Employment, Mau, District Mau, respondent no.

4 against the said order, the writ petitioner had preferred a representation dated 18.03.2025 page 37 of the paper book.

5. Questioning the order dated 07.02.2025 passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Self Employment, Mau, District Mau, respondent no. 4, the writ petitioner has been filed the present writ petition.

6. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner has submitted that post issuance of the notice dated 03.12.2024 seeking response of the writ petitioner, another communication came to be issued on 07.12.2024 to which the writ petitioner tendered his reply on 12.12.2024 which was acknowledged in the communication at page 31 of the paper book dated 22.01.2025 and thereafter the order impugned came to be passed on 07.02.2025 by the Deputy Commissioner, Self Employment, Mau, District Mau, respondent no. 4. He further submits that the reply was submitted by the writ petitioner on 12.12.2024 has not been considered. It is also contended that the said aspect of the matter was brought to the notice of the respondent no. 4 by virtue of the communication dated 18.03.2025 being the request letter of the writ petitioner.

7. Learned Standing Counsel on the other hand submits that whatever might be in case according to the writ petitioner his contentions are not being considered then the matter needs to be revisited.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the records carefully.

9. Apparently, the writ petitioner happens to be Bank Sakhi who has been issued a show cause notice on 03.12.2024 followed by another communication dated 07.12.2024 to which the writ petitioner claims to have tendered reply on 12.12.2024, however, the order dated 07.02.2025 came to be passed dispensing with the engagement of the writ petitioner.

10. Importantly, the reply dated 12.12.2024 stands mentioned in the communication of the respondents dated 22.01.2025 and the said aspect regarding submission of the reply to the show cause notice dated 12.12.2024 also finds place in the representation of the writ petitioner dated 18.03.2025.

11. Be that as it may be since the contentions raised have not been considered, thus, the writ petition is being decided in the following manner:

(a). The impugned order dated 07.02.2025 passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Self Employment, Mau, District Mau, respondent no. 4 is set aside.

(b). The matter stands remitted back to pass fresh order strictly in accordance with law within a period of two months from the date of presentation of the certified copy of the order.

12. The status of the writ petitioner as of today shall be maintained and the same shall be subject to the final order to be passed therein.

13. For facilitating early disposal, the party shall furnish the certified copy of the order and self-attested copy of the writ petition before the authority by 11.03.2026 and the authority shall proceed to decide the said proceeding with most expedition.

14. Accordingly, the writ petition stands **disposed of**.

February 18, 2026

Ashu

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)