



2026:AHC:7739

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 175 of 2026

Yashpal Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 8 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Akash Dwivedi, Madhaw Pandey, Shashank Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Akash Dwivedi, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Gaurav Singh, learned Standing Counsel for the State.

2. The writ petitioner herein had earlier preferred Writ-A No. 16821 of 2025 seeking the following relief:-

"1. Issue a writ in the nature of certiorari quashing the impugned order dated 11.09.2025 passed by respondent no.8 by which an amount of 16,42,227 has been deducted/recovered from the Post retiral dues of the petitioner(enclosed as an annexure-1) to this writ petition and also an amount of ₹2,08,470 has been deducted from the leave encashment amount of the petitioner (to which no order has been passed).

2. Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondent authorities to refund/pay the deducted/recovered amount of ₹16,42,227 and 2,08,470 to the petitioner along with interest, which has been deducted/recovered from the Post retiral dues of the petitioner.

3. Issue any other writ order or direction in favour of the petitioner as this Honourable Court deem fit and proper in the present facts and circumstances of the case so as to secure the ends of justice or else the petitioner shall suffer irreparably.

4. Award the cost of petition to the petitioner."

3. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner submits that now an order dated 2.09.2025 has been passed by Respondent no.5, Deputy Inspector General of Police (Intelligence), Headquarters, Lucknow, whereby his pension has been unilaterally reduced from Rs.1,19,000/- to Rs.1,05,550/-.

4. Questioning the same, present writ petition has been preferred.

5. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner submits that the order impugned cannot be sustained for the simple reason on the ground that it is in violation of the principles of natural justice. He further submits that the writ petitioner has not been put to notice and it is a case of fraud, concealment and misrepresentation.

6. Learned Standing Counsel on the other hand submits that the claim of the writ petitioner needs adjudication at the first instance by Respondent no.5.

5. Considering the submissions so made across the Bar, the writ petition is being decided in the following manner:-

(a) The writ petitioner shall file a comprehensive representation along with self attested copy of the writ petition and the certified copy of the order before Respondent no.5, who on the said motion shall issue a show cause notice to the writ petitioner and thereafter, a date be fixed for hearing and the writ petitioner shall tender his reply within a period of two months thereafter.

(b) The order dated 03.09.2025 shall be subject to further orders to be passed.

6. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands **disposed of**.

January 13, 2026
N.S.Rathour

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)