



2026:AHC:50347

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 3388 of 2026

Narendra Kumar

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Kushal Raj Chaudhary, Pradeep Saxena, Ram Naresh Maurya
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Pradeep Saxena, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Gaurav Singh, learned Standing Counsel, who appears for State-respondents.
2. The counsel for the rival parties have made a joint statement that they do not propose to file any further affidavits thus with the consent of the parties, writ petition is being decided at the fresh stage.
3. The case of the writ petitioner is that he is a Class-IV employee who was working in the office of Zila Krishi Raksha Adhikari, Bareilly and he came to be transferred on 29.06.2024, he was transferred to the office of Deputy Director of Agriculture, Pilibhit. The said transfer order came to be challenged in Writ-A No. 14380 of 2024 which came to be dismissed on 21.09.2024 against which the writ petitioner preferred a Special Appeal No. 977 of 2024 which was also dismissed on 24.10.2024 thereafter the writ petitioner represented before the respondents post joining on the transfer place for being transferred back to Barielly, particularly, on account of medical issues, the said request was allowed on 10.01.2025 by the Joint Director of Agriculture, Bareilly Division Bareilly, however, the said order came to be cancelled by the Additional Director Administration, State of U.P. on 18.11.2025 on the ground that the order dated 10.01.2025 was passed without any approval and authority.
4. Questioning the same, the writ petitioner has been filed the present writ petition.
5. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner has submitted that though the writ

petitioner has joined the transfer place but on account of medical exigency, he ought to have been sent back from Pilibhit to Bareilly and that was rightly done on 10.01.2025 which has been upset by virtue of the order dated 18.11.2025.

6. Learned Standing Counsel on the other hand submits that be that as it may be, it is always open for the writ petitioner to make a request for transfer to Pilibhit in the ensuing transfer sessions once the new transfer policy comes into existence.

7. To such a submission, learned counsel for the petitioner has no objection and he gracefully accepts the same.

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

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

10. Leaving it open for the writ petitioner to approach the competent court or authority once new transfer policy comes into existence in the ensuing transfer sessions and in case such a request is made then the Court has no reason to disbelieve then the same shall be considered strictly in accordance with law.

March 12, 2026

Ashu

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)