



2025:AHC:179034

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 11390 of 2017

Amarjeet and 13 others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union of India and 3 others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Amit Kumar Tiwari, Raj Kumar Singh, Rajesh Kumar Verma, Seemant Singh, Sheshadri Trivedi, Shiv Bahadur Singh, Siddharth Khare
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: A.S.G.I., Anant Kumar Tiwari, Shravan Kr.Dubey Uoi

Court No. - 34

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Amit Kumar Tiwari, learned counsel for the writ petitioners and Sri Anant Kumar Tiwari for the respondents.
2. At the very outset, the writ petitioners made a statement at bar that out of the total writ petitioners who are 14 in number, the writ petitioner is only pressing writ petition on behalf of writ petitioner no. 7, Surendra Kumar son of Ganesh Prasad and with respect to the other, the writ petition be dismissed.
3. Accordingly, the writ petition against writ petitioners no. 1 to 6 and 8 to 14 is dismissed.
4. The case of the writ petitioner is that recruitment process to be initiated for appointment on the post of Constable G.D. pursuant to a notice dated 24.01.2015 and the writ petitioner claiming himself to be fully eligible and qualified applied for the same under the District Code 58 which belongs to Naxal hit area and admit cards were sought to be issued for physical examination to be conducted between 25.05.2015 and 22.07.2015 and roll number was allotted to the writ petitioner was 3013091771 and the examination centre of the writ petitioner was CR, Varanasi (3013) under OBC category, however, in the column relatable to

permanent/domicile request, the writ petitioner had mentioned Village Shishta Kala Dadhiram, Thana Madhihan. Thereafter the writ petitioner appeared in the physical examination test and admit cards were issued for written examination on 04.10.2015, he appeared in the examination on 14.03.2016, results were declared but the result of the writ petitioner was not declared. On inquiry the writ petitioner was apprised that he had filled incorrect form without disclosing the district which happened to be Mirzapur district, thus, a discrepancy stood crept pursuant where to his results were not declared. Though correspondences were being made but the writ petitioner claim was not considered and, thus, the present writ petition came to be preferred quashing the result dated 02.02.2017 issued by the third respondent in that regard. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner has submitted that though there happen to be an error but the said error would not be incurable error particularly when the district of the writ petitioner was Mirzapur and there are certain documents which are available with him being the domicile certificate which shows that the writ petitioner belongs to Mirzapur. Submission is that, in case, there are vacancies lying vacant then the writ petitioner be accommodated as other writ petitioner have been accommodated in that regard.

5. Sri Anant Kumar Tiwari, learned counsel for the Union of India submits that though the present writ petition virtually would not be maintainable in absence of impleading the affected parties as, in case, the writ petitioner is not to implead all the affected parties but certain persons whose rights would be kept in jeopardy be also impleaded in representative capacity. He further submits that it is for the writ petitioner to approach the competent authority raising its grievance.

6. Having heard the submission so made across the bar and looking into the overall fact situation, this Court without delving into the issue further disposes of the writ petitioner requiring the writ petitioner to appear before respondent no. 3, UP Nideshak (Namankan), Staff Selection Commission (Central Region), Lowther Road, Allahabad for redressal of his grievance by filing a representation and on the same, the authority

shall proceed to decide the claim of the writ petitioner.

7. Needless to point out that, in case, the third respondent is of the opinion that the matter needs to be decided by some other authority, then the papers be transmitted to the same. It is clarified that the Court has not gone into the merits of the matter and the authorities shall pass a reasoned and speaking order within a period of three months looking into the entitlement, suitability, eligibility and the vacancies, if any.

8. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands disposed of.

October 8, 2025
Rajesh

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)