



2026:AHC:40561

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 9268 of 2025

Rahul Kumar

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Aklank Kumar Jain, Kuldeep Singh Tomar
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Aklank Jain, learned counsel for the writ petitioner and Sri Brijesh Kumar Srivastava, learned Standing Counsel for the State.
2. This Court entertained the writ petition on 10.07.2025 and sought instructions.
3. Instructions are available on record under the signatures of the respondent no. 2 dated 29.07.2025.
4. Sri B.K. Srivastava, 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.
5. The case of the writ petitioner is that a notification came to be issued by U.P. Police Recruitment and Promotion Board inviting online application for 936 posts, the writ petitioner applied in pursuance thereof claiming himself to be fully eligible and qualified. In the application form, the writ petitioner disclosed the academic qualification of diploma in Computer Science Engineering from Glocal University Saharanpur. According to the writ petitioner, he participated in the selection, he was issued an admit card and according to the writ petitioner, he presumed that he had obtained 330 marks in the Computer Based Test result dated 31.01.2024. However, according to the writ petitioner when the final result stood published on 27.06.2025, the name of the writ petitioner did not find in the list of the selected candidates.

6. Questioning the same, the present writ petitioner came to be preferred.

7. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner submits that the basic ground attributable in terming the writ petitioner to be unsuitable is the fact that as per clause 3.2 one of the qualification is possession of diploma in Computer Science Engineering but since a degree came to be awarded by Glocal University Saharanpur mentioning therein that degree or diploma in Computer Science Engineering is being awarded, thus, the respondents came up with the stand that the writ petitioner possessed degree and not diploma required faculty. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner submits that the academic qualification which the writ petitioner possesses is diploma in Computer Science Engineering though in the format for issuance of diploma the word degree was used the same cannot partake the character of degree in place of diploma.

8. Sri B.K. Srivastava, learned Standing Counsel submits that whatever might be it is for the writ petitioner to approach the third respondent, Additional Secretary (Recruitment) U.P. Police, Recruitment and Promotion Board, Lucknow who shall consider the grievance of the writ petitioner.

9. Considering the submission so made across the bar and after perusing the record, the writ petition stands **disposed of** requiring the writ petitioner to file a comprehensive representation along with self attested copy of the writ petition, certified copy of the order along with self attested copy of the diploma in Computer Science Engineering and the respondent no. 3, Additional Secretary (Recruitment) U.P. Police, Recruitment and Promotion Board, Lucknow shall decide the claim of the writ petitioner within a period of two months. In case, the third respondent is of the opinion that the matter needs to be redressed by any other authority then the paper be transmitted to it.

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

February 23, 2026

Rajesh

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)