



2026:AHC:66364

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 2122 of 2026

Deependra Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

U.P. State Road Transport
Corporation And 2 Others

.....Respondents(s)

Counsel for Petitioners(s)	: Bhawesh Pratap Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: Sheo Ram Singh

Alongwith Writ-A Nos. 2123 of 2026; 2548 of 2026; 2124 of 2026; 2125 of 2026; 2127 of 2026; 2134 of 2026; 2135 of 2026; 2136 of 2026; 2139 of 2026; and, 2140 of 2026

Court No. - 32

HON'BLE SAURABH SHYAM SHAMSHERY, J.

1. Heard Sri Bhavesh Pratap Singh, learned counsel for petitioners and Sri Sheo Ram Singh, learned counsel for respondents.

2. This Court passed following order on 12.02.2026:

"1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in pursuance to the judgment dated 9.9.2025 passed in Writ-A No. 14886 of 2022 (Arvind Singh Vs. U.P. State Road Transport Corporation and others) respondents have initiated fresh enquiry proceedings in respect of an incident which has occurred in the year 2012. Paragraph no. 14 of the aforesaid judgment is quoted hereinbelow:-

"14. The Court also takes note of rival submissions on the issue of arbitration clause. Though at this stage Court is of the opinion that petitioners have challenged the order of

termination directly before this Court but otherwise also respondents have not shows any instances where arbitration clause was actually acted upon. Therefore, at this stage to consider the rival submissions to the extent that whether arbitration clause is valid or not, would not be appropriate and petitioners will have a liberty to challenge the same as and when situation so warrants as well as if the case was not referred or referred to arbitration it would make no difference since the Court is of the opinion that in such cases where impugned orders being stigmatic and passed without giving any opportunity whatsoever, as required by Circular dated 27.04.2023, are liable to be set aside. However, the respondents will have two options, i.e., either to conduct inquiry afresh after giving opportunity of hearing or to permit the petitioners to execute fresh contract and at that stage it will be incumbent on respondents to clarify all conditions mentioned in contract and it is upto the petitioners to accept it or not or to take any legal remedy, as available in accordance with law."

2. The submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that judgment dated 9.9.2025 provides two options to the respondents either to proceed afresh in the enquiry or execute fresh contract. The respondents have proceeded for holding fresh enquiry. Confronted with the situation as to the fact that fresh enquiry has been accorded in pursuance to the judgment dated 9.9.2025 although the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that similarly placed persons have been protected by judgment dated 14.7.2025 that those employees who have committed misconduct in last one or two years employer has been granted liberty to hold enquiry afresh. The similar finding has to be read in the order dated 9.9.2025. Learned counsel for the petitioner could not dispute the fact that judgment dated 9.9.2025 does not contain such stipulation.

3. Confronted with such stipulation, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he may be granted time to approach learned Single Judge for clarification/review of the earlier order dated 9.9.2025.

4. List this case on 12.3.2026 as fresh."

3. Learned counsel for petitioners submits that petitioner herein has filed an application for clarification in Writ-A No. 14886 of 2022 and he will also file an application for clarification Writ-A No. 9015 of 2023.

4. In aforesaid circumstances, all writ petitions are disposed of with liberty to petitioners to file appropriate application in the writ petitions filed earlier by them which were disposed of in terms of **Arvind Singh vs. U.P. State Road Transport Corporation and others, 2025:AHC:158107.**

MARCH 30, 2026
AK

(Saurabh Shyam Shamschery,J.)