



2026:AHC:34437-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 1063 of 2025

Ram Abhilash Laskar

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and 2 others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Mani Shanker Pandey, Rama Nand Shukla
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: A.S.G.I., Sudarshan Singh

Chief Justice's Court

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

1. This petition is directed against the order dated 05.11.2024 passed by Central Administrative Tribunal, Allahabad Bench, Allahabad, whereby the Original Application ('OA') filed by the petitioner against the termination order dated 12.08.2014 and appellate order dated 08.08.2023, has been dismissed.

2. The petitioner, while working on the post of Laskar, was convicted for the offences under Sections 307, 504 and 506 I.P.C. on 07.06.2010. He was granted bail by the High Court and realization of fine was stayed during the pendency of the appeal.

3. A notice was issued on 29.11.2013 to the petitioner as to why his services should not be terminated on account of his conviction in a criminal case, to which a response was filed, however, by order dated 12.08.2014, the petitioner was dismissed from service.

4. The petitioner approached the High Court by filing Writ Petition No. 44715 of 2014, which was decided on 03.09.2021 requiring the petitioner to approach the Tribunal. The OA filed before the Tribunal came to be decided requiring the petitioner to file appeal, which appeal came to be rejected by order dated 08.08.2023.

5. Submissions were made that the orders were passed by the respondents without application of mind. Despite the fact that the petitioner was granted bail by the High Court, the petitioner was dismissed, therefore, orders impugned deserve to be quashed and set aside.

6. The Tribunal, after hearing the parties, came to the conclusion that the respondents have thoroughly considered the issues involved and has passed a speaking order recording reasons for passing of the orders impugned and, consequently, dismissed the OA. Feeling aggrieved, present petition has been filed.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner reiterated the submissions that once the bail was granted by the High Court, there was no reason for the respondents to have terminated the services of the petitioner on account of the conviction in a criminal case. It was sought to be emphasized that the reasons recorded for termination are not justified.

8. Counsel for the respondents supported the order impugned.

9. We have considered the submissions made and have perused the material available on record.

10. The conviction of the petitioner is not disputed. Further the High Court has only stayed the sentence and has granted bail, however, the conviction has not been stayed and till such time that the conviction is not stayed/set aside, the petitioner, based on the fact that the bail has been granted in the matter, cannot seek any relief.

11. Further the order impugned has been passed taking into consideration all the aspects and material available on record and after

coming to the conclusion that the conviction exterminates petitioner's character as a government servant, which has caused irreparable harm to his integrity and renders him extremely unsuitable for retention in the service.

12. The order passed by the Tribunal is in consonance with the requirements of law and counsel for the petitioner failed to point out any infirmity in the said order so as to require interference by this Court.

13. Consequently, there is no substance in the petition. The same is, therefore, dismissed.

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

February 13, 2026

P.Sri.