



2026:AHC:48268

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 3293 of 2026

Santosh Kumar Srivastava

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Amit Kumar, Nishtha Kesarwani
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Amit Kumar, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Jitendra Prasad, learned Standing Counsel for the State.

2. Though the writ petitioner claims to have been engaged as Computer Operator on contractual basis but his services came to be dispensed with. He preferred writ petition bearing no. 5383 of 2024 which came to be disposed of on 25.04.2024 requiring the respondents to decide the representation and the said representation came to be rejected on 09.09.2024 which is subject matter of challenge in the present writ petition. According to the learned counsel for the writ petitioner, the writ petitioner would avail the remedies which are available under law.

3. Accordingly, the writ petition stands **disposed of**. In the opinion of the Court, once a legal remedy is available then it is always open for the writ petitioner to take recourse to the same and obviously, in case, there is delay then the same be condoned under the provisions contained under the Limitation Act.

(Vikas Budhwar, J.)

March 10, 2026

Rajesh