



2026:AHC:39754

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 2656 of 2026

Ram Ratan Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Rupendra Kumar Mishra
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Upendra Kumar Mishra, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri R.S. Umrao, learned Standing Counsel for the State.
2. Sr R.S. Umrao, learned Standing Counsel has made a statement at bar that he is possessed with the instructions and he is in a position to argue the matter and he does not propose to file any affidavit, the writ petition be decided on the basis of the documents available on record. With the consent of the parties, the writ petition is being decided at the fresh stage.
3. The case of the writ petitioner is that he was appointed on the post of Home Guard on 11.02.2001 a first information report being Case Crime No. 170 of 2022 came to be lodged against the writ petitioner under Sections, 307, 506 IPC and the writ petitioner was arrested on 08.01.2023 a show cause notice was issued on 24.01.2023 to which the writ petitioner submitted his reply on 01.02.2023. The writ petitioner was reinstated in service on 23.03.2023, however, a show cause notice came to be issued by respondent no. 4 on 29.08.2025 to which the writ petitioner has tendered reply, however, the writ petitioner has not been permitted to resume the duties based upon the Government Order dated 18.08.2023. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner submits that the classification so carved out by the respondents based upon the offences for which punishment is 7 years and above came to be subject matter of challenge in **Mahesh Singh Vs. State of U.P.: Writ-A No. 16186 of 2024** decided on 26.09.2025 and Clauses 5, 6 and 8 of the Government Order dated 18.08.2023 was rendered ultra vires. Learned counsel for the writ

petitioner submits that the writ petitioner is to be reinstated in service.

4. Sri R.S. Umrao, learned Standing Counsel submits that whatever might be once the writ petitioner is responded to the show cause notice, the decision is taken in the light of the judgment in **Mahesh Singh (supra)**.

5. Considering the submission so made across the bar and after perusing the record, this Court is of the opinion that since the writ petitioner has already replied to the show cause notice and there happens to be a judgment in **Mahesh Singh (supra)**, thus, the authority who has issued the show cause notice is directed to decide the proceedings within a period of six weeks strictly in the light of the judgment in the case of **Mahesh Singh (supra)**.

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

7. Instructions filed today are taken on record and marked as Appendix 'A'.

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)

February 23, 2026

Rajesh