



2026:AHC:48676

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 2747 of 2026

Ravikant Srivastava

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Santosh Mani Shukla
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri A.K. Tiwari (AoR A/A 0088/12) holding brief of Santosh Mani Shukla, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Gaurav Singh, learned Standing Counsel for the State.
2. The writ petitioner claims to have been engaged in the office of ARTO, Azamgarh as Data Entry Operator in the year 2019 through respondent no. 3 which happens to be an outsourcing agency, however, as per the writ petitioner, he worked till 29.11.2025. Thereafter, with the change of the outsourcing agency, he has not been re-engaged.
3. Prayer in the present petition is to re-engage and re-appoint the writ petitioner.
4. Sri Gaurav Singh, learned Standing Counsel submits that once it is the stand of the writ petitioner that he has been engaged as Data Entry Operator by an outsourcing agency then the remedy lies elsewhere.
5. I have heard the submissions so made across the bar and perused the record.
6. Once, the writ petitioner has been engaged by an outsourcing agency then, in case of change of the outsourcing agency, he has not been re-engaged. It is for the writ petitioner to take appropriate proceedings against the outsourcing agency for which writ under Article 226 is not a remedy.

7. The writ petition stands **disposed of** leaving it open for the writ petitioner to take appropriate remedy which is available under law.

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)

March 10, 2026
Rajesh