



2026:AHC:36224

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 1720 of 2026

Saroj Sharma

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Nand Lal Pandey, Suyash Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Suyash Pandey, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Manish Kumar, learned Standing Counsel, who appears for State-respondents.
2. This court entertained this petition on 05.02.2026 while directing the learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel to obtain instructions and thereafter the matter was fixed for today. Instructions have been supplied by Sri Manish Kumar, learned Standing Counsel, submits that he is well equipped with the instructions and the instructions are self-sufficient for disposal of the writ petition and he does not propose to file any further affidavit and the petition be decided on the basis of the documents available on record, 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 the writ petitioner claims to be the widow of one Rajendra Kumar Sharma who retired as Sub-Inspector in the year 2011 and thereafter expired on 30.05.2023. The writ petitioner though claims to be a widow but alleging that one Beena Sharma @ Beena Kaushik had staked her claim to be the wife of the deceased thus according to the writ petitioner, inquiry stood conducted pursuant where to it was found that the writ petitioner is the legally wedded wife. According to the writ petitioner, on 21.11.2025, the Senior Superintendent of Police, Saharanpur has issue a communication to the writ petitioner to produce certain documents.
4. Questioning the same, the writ petitioner has been filed the present writ

petition.

5. Post passing of the order, today instructions have been forwarded under the signature of Senior Superintendent of Police, Saharanpur, dated 16.02.2026 which is taken on record and marked as Appendix A.

6. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner has submitted that already in the inquiry so conducted, the writ petitioner was found to be the wife of the deceased thus the High School certificate as well as the succession certificate so sought are not to be furnished.

7. Learned Standing Counsel on the other hand submits that whatever might be the writ petitioner was required on 21.11.2025 to furnish documents which the writ petitioner had not furnished and in case certain document are not to be furnished which are beyond the possession of the writ petitioner then the writ petitioner should insist for non-furnishing of the documents before the respondents.

8. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record, in the opinion of the Court, once on 21.11.2025, the writ petitioner was required to furnish the certain documents and in case the writ petitioner is not in a position to furnish those documents then the writ petitioner should furnish those documents which are in possession and seek exemption of furnishing of those documents which the writ petitioner is not possessing. The respondents shall pass a reasoned and speaking order, particularly, this Court is not required to travel into the mind of the adjudicating authority and it is for the adjudicating authority to pass an order strictly in accordance with law.

9. Needless to point out that the said exercise conducted strictly in accordance with law within a period of three months from the date of presentation of the certified copy of the order that too after hearing the affected parties, if any.

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

February 18, 2026

Ashu

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)