



2025:AHC:160403

A.F.R.

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 12336 of 2025

Pankaj Mathur

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Arpit Agarwal, Rahul Saxena
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C., Shashi Kant Srivastava

Court No. - 52

HON'BLE MRS. MANJU RANI CHAUHAN, J.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Shashi Kant Srivastava, learned counsel for respondent-B.S.A. as well as learned Standing Counsel for the State.

The present petition has been filed with the prayer to quash the impugned order dated 4.4.2025 passed by the District Basic Education Officer, Pilibhit vide which the appointment of the petitioner as Assistant Teacher stands cancelled.

Placing the facts of the case, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was appointed as Assistant Teacher, in accordance with law, pursuant to the selections as made in the Assistant Teacher Recruitment Examination, 2020. Accordingly, appointment letter dated 5.12.2020 was issued to the petitioner and he joined at Primary School Pagawan, Development Area Bilsanda, District- Pilibhit on 29.1.2021 on the post of Assistant Teacher. Since then, the petitioner has been discharging his duties with utmost honesty and integrity, there being no complaint whatsoever against him.

The petitioner had qualified for the post of Assistant Teacher and relevant educational documents were supplied by the petitioner to the respondent authorities, after verification of which, appointment was given to the petitioner. The petitioner has placed the said documents as Annexure No.3 to the present petition which were placed before the respondent authorities for verification of the same. The said documents include :-

(a) High School mark-sheet, issued by the Board of High School and Intermediate Education, Uttar Pradesh having Serial No.33022904, wherein High School is shown to be passed in the year 2010 with Roll No.1141730 and the date of birth is shown as 15.5.1995.

- (b) High School passing certificate bearing Serial No.1249699.
- (c) Intermediate certificate-cum-mark-sheet, issued by the Board of High School and Intermediate Education, Uttar Pradesh having Certificate No.209023, wherein Intermediate is shown to be passed in the year 2012 with Roll No.2164760.
- (d) Bachelor of Arts from Chhatrapati Sahu Ji Maharaj University, Kanpur, a three years course certificate examination, passed in the year 2016 with second division having Enrollment No.CSJMA13000125472.
- (e) Bachelor of Arts Degree issued by Chhatrapati Sahu Ji Maharaj University, Kanpur with Roll No.6121617.
- (f) B.T.C. Two Years Course Examination 2017 (Batch 2015) First Semester, issued by Examination Regulatory Authority, Uttar Pradesh, Allahabad with Roll No.151080267.
- (g) B.T.C. Two Years Course Examination 2017 (Batch 2015) Second Semester, issued by Examination Regulatory Authority, Uttar Pradesh, Allahabad with Roll No.161080312.
- (h) B.T.C. Two Years Course Examination 2018 (Batch 2015) Third Semester, issued by Examination Regulatory Authority, Uttar Pradesh, Allahabad with Roll No.172080034.
- (i) B.T.C. Two Years Course Examination 2018 (Batch 2015) Fourth Semester, issued by Examination Regulatory Authority, Uttar Pradesh, Allahabad with Roll No.181080333.
- (j) Basic Teacher Certificate Two Year Course Batch 2015 (Examination Year 2018) issued by Examination Regulatory Authority, Uttar Pradesh with Roll No.181080333.
- (k) Uttar Pradesh Teacher Eligibility Test-2018 certificate (Primary Level) as issued by Examination Regulatory Authority, U.P. 23 Allenganj, Prayagraj with Roll No.1110905733.
- (l) The result of Assistant Teacher Recruitment Examination-2019, shown as qualified with Roll no.08113618600.
- (m) Domicile Certificate issued by Government of Uttar Pradesh having Certificate No.212192001280.
- (n) Caste Certificate issued by Government of Uttar Pradesh having Certificate No.212194000305.
- (o) Character Certificate.

(p) Fitness Certificate.

It appears that some complaint was made by one Vinay Kumar on 10.1.2024 with the allegation that the petitioner had appeared twice in High School and Intermediate examination, therefore, an inquiry was conducted relying upon which, the impugned order has been passed without giving any notice or opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, therefore, the order impugned is arbitrary, illegal and unsustainable in the eyes of law.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the order impugned has been passed without providing any opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, therefore, it is illegal and against the principles of natural justice. Relying upon a complaint, without following the proper procedure as prescribed under law, the order impugned cancelling the appointment of the petitioner has been passed which is against the settled principles of law as held by the Apex Court and Hon'ble Court in catena of judgments.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that at no point of time, the certificate of High School and Intermediate have been annulled by the Board or any competent authority thus, relying upon the allegations as made in the complaint that the petitioner has passed High School and Intermediate twice, passing the impugned order is not sustainable in the eyes of law.

Learned counsel for the petitioner in support of his submission has relied upon a judgement passed by Division Bench of this Court in Special Appeal Defective No. - 9 of 2024 (Basic Shiksha Adhikari vs. Laxmi Shakya And 3 Others) as decided on 24.05.2024, wherein the Court was of the view that where the petitioner has undergone through any examination twice and none of them have been declared a nullity by the competent Examination Board, rather the certificates which were used by the petitioner therein were found to be genuine on verification by the concerned Examination Body, unless the same is declared null & void by the competent Examination Authority, the services of the petitioner cannot be terminated on the aforesaid ground.

The aforesaid order in the special appeal was passed relying upon the case of **Kuldeep Kumar Pathak vs. State of U.P. & Others** reported in (2016) 2 SCC 521, **Laxmi Shanker Yadav vs. State of U.P. And 4 Others (Writ-A No.5394 of 2021)** as decided by the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court on 14.9.2021, **A. Dharmraj vs. The Educational Officer Puddukkottai & Others** reported in (2022) 11 SCC 629 as well as judgment passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **Special Appeal No.124 of 2023 (Rao Mohammad Arif vs. State of U.P. and 4 Others)**. Relying upon Clause 17(1) (2) as well as Clause 19 (9) of U.P. Intermediate Education Act, which came into force with effect from 28.7.2021, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the aforesaid

provides for prohibition from appearing in the high school and intermediate examination from different schools, twice in the same year, cannot be applied retrospectively.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the impugned order of cancellation is arbitrary and is in violation of principles of natural justice. It is urged that once the appointment was made, it could not have been cancelled without holding a regular departmental inquiry. In support of his submission, he has relied upon a judgment passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **Writ- A No. - 1111 of 2023 (Laxmi Shakya vs. State Of U.P. And 3 Others)** as decided on **10.4.2023**, in which it has been specifically held that there is no bar to obtain overlapping or parallel certificates of high school and intermediate and there is no regulatory framework prohibiting two simultaneous degrees. The aforesaid clauses in the relevant Act also do not prohibit two certificates for the same course.

Learned counsel for respondent-B.S.A., however, submits that the petitioner has sought appointment as Assistant Teacher using the high school mark-sheet of the year 2010 having Roll No.1141730 and intermediate mark-sheet of the year 2012 having Roll No.2164760, which shows changed date of birth and increased marks. Thus, the petitioner has concealed the fact about passing out the high school and intermediate examination twice and has mislead the authorities while concealing the aforesaid fact and seeking appointment as Assistant Teacher, therefore, there is no illegality or infirmity in the order impugned.

Per contra, learned Standing Counsel submits that the petitioner had played fraud upon the authorities by concealing material facts and securing appointment on false premises. It is argued that an appointment obtained by concealment of fact or misrepresentation is a nullity in the eyes of law, and no vested right flows from such an illegal entry into service.

Heard learned counsels for the parties and perused the record.

From the records, it is evident that on a complaint as made against the petitioner, regarding petitioner's passing high school and intermediate examination twice, showing lesser age and obtaining appointment, an inquiry was conducted on 19.1.2024 by Block Education Officer, Bilsanda, directing him to scrutinize the educational certificates as placed by the petitioner and place a report accordingly but he did not provide the same.

Several dates were fixed calling the petitioner, the concerned Block Education Officer and the complainant, to find out the reality as made in the complaint. On 22nd May 2024, the petitioner provided the relevant educational documents i.e. the online mark-sheets of high school

examination of the years 2009 & 2010, the mark-sheet of intermediate examination of the years 2011 & 2012, B.T.C. Training 2015, Registration Certificate of B.T.C. Training 2015 and an affidavit in the office of respondent no.3, namely, District Basic Education Officer, Pilibhit.

The complainant Vinay Kumar had also filed an affidavit, mentioning therein that the petitioner had passed high school and intermediate twice i.e. high school in the year 2009 as well as 2010 and intermediate in the year 2011 as well as 2012. In the high school mark sheet of the year 2009, the date of birth of the petitioner was shown as 15.5.1994 and that in the year 2010, it was shown as 15.5.1995. Thus, in order to ascertain the truth, on 25.5.2024, notice was given to the petitioner to place his explanation in this regard. The petitioner, accordingly, submitted a representation on 10.6.2024, mentioning therein that a false complaint has been made by Vinay Kumar who has also not appeared before the authorities concerned during the hearings, despite several notices and opportunities being given to him. The photograph and Aadhaar card of the complainant has also not been annexed in the affidavit as given by the him and a false complaint has been made for the purposes of mental harassment of the petitioner.

By letter dated 18.6.2024, the District Basic Education Officer, Pilibhit fixed the date for hearing on 25.6.2024 at 11:00AM, wherein the complainant was also required to be present. The aforesaid notice was sent at the complainant's address as mentioned in the affidavit but the address as mentioned could not be found and the phone number was also incorrect, therefore, the notice returned from the post office. By letter dated 5.7.2024, again the date fixed for hearing was 12.7.2024 at 11:00AM. The aforesaid notice also could not be served to the complainant. In order to know the correctness of the allegations as mentioned in the complaint, a two member committee, comprising of the Block Education Officer, Bisalpur and Block Education Officer, Barkhera was constituted. The aforesaid committee did not submit any report, therefore, on 8.11.2024 again a direction was issued to the aforesaid committee to submit a report. In the inquiry report as submitted on 9.11.2024, it was found that the petitioner changing his date of birth has passed high school and intermediate twice. The high school mark-sheet of the year 2010 and the intermediate mark-sheet of the year 2012 has been placed before the authorities to obtain appointment as Assistant Teacher without disclosing the fact about high school and intermediate being passed in the year 2009 and 2011 also. Thus, *prima facie* finding that the allegations as made by the complainant were correct, notice dated 20.11.2024 was sent to the petitioner, requiring him to submit his reply/explanation. The petitioner did not appear before respondent no.3 on 27.11.2024 at 3 O'clock as directed, therefore, another opportunity by means of notice dated 12.12.2024, was provided to him to appear on 16.12.2024 at 11:00AM. On 12.12.2024, complainant, namely, Mr.

Bhaiyalal S/o Mr. Kanhaiya Lal was present who submitted his photograph pasted affidavit along with Aadhaar card, mentioning about the same allegations as made in the earlier complaint.

The petitioner appeared before the respondent no.3 on 16.12.2024 and placed his written explanation accepting that he has passed high school and intermediate twice. He has further admitted in his explanation that as he was not aware about the fact that he has to disclose this fact of passing high school and intermediate twice before the appointing authority, therefore, due to ignorance, he could not mention about the aforesaid fact and has tendered apology for the same. He has submitted in his explanation that he has sought appointment on the post of Assistant Teacher by placing one mark-sheet only. The authorities concerned after perusing the complaint as made by Vinay Kumar S/o Ishwar Prasad and Bhaiyalal S/o Kanhaiya Lal as well as the report submitted by the Two Member Committee and explanation as submitted by the petitioner-Pankaj Mathur, found that the petitioner has passed high school and intermediate twice, thus, found that the allegations as made in the complaint were correct.

The District Level Committee found it necessary to get an inquiry of the mark-sheets of the petitioner conducted by the Secretary, U.P. Madhyamik Shiksha Board, Prayagraj, therefore, on 7.1.2025, the Secretary was directed to inquire about the petitioner's high school mark-sheets of the years 2009 & 2010 and intermediate mark-sheets of the years 2011 & 2012 and ascertain as to which mark-sheet is genuine. Accordingly, the Secretary, U.P. Madhyamik Shiksha Board, Prayagraj vide letter dated 10.3.2025 as modified on 17.3.2025, has provided the following information :-

"कि इण्टरमीडिएट शिक्षा अधिनियम, 1921 के अधीन बनाये गये विनियमों के अध्याय - बारह विनियम-17 (1) एवं 17 (2) के अनुसार कोई भी परीक्षार्थी जिसने हाईस्कूल या इण्टरमीडिएट परीक्षा अथवा उसके समकक्ष परीक्षा उत्तीर्ण कर ली है, बाद की हाईस्कूल या इण्टरमीडिएट परीक्षा में कन्प्यूटर विषय को छोड़कर हाईस्कूल में पाँच तथा इण्टरमीडिएट परीक्षा में चार विषयों में ही प्रविष्ट हो सकता है। उक्त विनियमों के अनुसार परीक्षार्थी श्री पंकज माथुर द्वारा दुबारा जन्म तिथि बदल कर दुबारा सम्पूर्ण के साथ अलग-अलग जनपदों से उत्तीर्ण की गयी हाईस्कूल परीक्षा वर्ष-2010 अनु0 1141730 एवं इण्टरमीडिएट परीक्षा वर्ष - 2012 अनु0 2164760 का परीक्षाफल वैध नहीं है।"

The Secretary, U.P. Madhyamik Shiksha Board, Prayagraj further concluded that from the aforesaid it is clear that the petitioner has passed high school and intermediate examination twice in different years, from different institutions, changing the date of birth as mentioned earlier. Thus, the petitioner has obtained appointment by showing the changed date of birth and for the sake of taking undue advantage, deliberately not disclosed about passing high school and intermediate examination twice, thus, misleading the authorities while seeking appointment as Assistant Teacher pursuant to the advertisement for selection of 69000 Assistant

Teachers. Thus, relying upon the aforesaid inquiry, after giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, the order impugned has been passed.

The present case reveals that the petitioner, while seeking public employment, deliberately suppressed the material fact of having passed the High School and Intermediate examinations twice. He further manipulated his candidature by utilizing the altered date of birth and enhanced marks obtained in the subsequent examination, without disclosing the same to the appointing authority and has succeeded in securing appointment to the post of Assistant Teacher. Such conduct is not only fraudulent but also amounts to a calculated deception played upon the appointing authority. It is trite law that fraud vitiates every solemn act and no person can be permitted to reap the fruits of an employment obtained by suppression, misrepresentation or falsification of documents. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **S.P. Chengalvaraya Naidu v. Jagannath**, reported in (1994) 1 SCC 1, has categorically held that a person who approaches the Court with unclean hands and suppresses material facts is not entitled to any relief. Similarly, in **A.P. Public Service Commission v. B. Sarat Chandra**, reported in (1990) 2 SCC 669, it was observed that when an appointment is obtained by concealment of fact or misrepresentation, the same is void ab initio and liable to be cancelled forthwith. This Court in the case of **Writ-A No.20140 of 2023 (Kamlesh Kumar Nirankari vs. State of U.P. And 2 Others)** as decided on 25.08.2025 has held that in case the employment has been obtained based on fraudulent documents on concealing material facts, the beneficiary of such fraud cannot seek any inquiry in terms of Uttar Pradesh Government Servant (Discipline and Appeal) Rules 1999.

It is a settled proposition of law that any appointment secured on the basis of fraud, concealment or misrepresentation does not confer any legal right upon the incumbent. Fraud vitiates every solemn act. The petitioner, having obtained appointment by misrepresentation of facts and by playing fraud upon the authorities, cannot be permitted to retain the fruits of such illegality. His appointment, being tainted from the very inception, is void ab initio and non est in the eyes of law.

Even otherwise, when the very foundation of an appointment is based upon falsehood and concealment, no equity can be claimed by the incumbent. The principle of natural justice has no application in such a case where fraud unravels everything. The employer is fully justified in cancelling such an appointment without holding a detailed departmental inquiry.

When an appointment is obtained by suppression of facts such as double passing of examinations, manipulation of date of birth, or enhancement of marks without disclosure, such employment is void ab initio. No vested right accrues to the petitioner, and the appointing authority is entitled to

cancel the appointment forthwith, without conducting a detailed departmental inquiry.

The petitioner was appointed as an Assistant Teacher pursuant to the selection process conducted by the Basic Shiksha Parishad. It subsequently came to light that the petitioner had passed the High School as well as the Intermediate Examinations on two occasions. While applying for public employment, the petitioner deliberately suppressed the fact of having appeared twice in the said examinations. Not only this, the petitioner secured benefit of the altered date of birth and enhanced marks obtained in the subsequent examination, without disclosing the same to the appointing authority. Upon discovery of the concealment, the respondents cancelled the appointment of the petitioner treating it to be void ab initio.

It is a settled proposition of law that fraud vitiates every solemn act. Suppression of material facts, particularly in the matter of public employment, amounts to fraud upon the employer. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Union of India v. M. Bhaskaran** reported in **1995 Supp (4) SCC 100**, categorically held that an appointment obtained on the basis of forged or fabricated documents is void ab initio and no departmental inquiry is required before cancelling such appointment. Similarly, in **Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan v. Ram Ratan Yadav** reported in **(2003) 3 SCC 437**, the Apex Court ruled that suppression of material facts or furnishing false information disentitles a candidate from continuing in service. Again, in **Avtar Singh v. Union of India** reported in **(2016) 8 SCC 471**, it has been reiterated that honesty and integrity are the basic requirements for public employment, and suppression of material information or misrepresentation would render the appointment invalid.

Applying the aforesaid principles to the facts of the present case, it is manifest that the petitioner deliberately concealed that he had passed the High School and Intermediate twice and had availed benefit of altered date of birth and enhanced marks. Such conduct is nothing short of fraud. Once the very foundation of the appointment is based on falsehood, the appointment is non est in the eyes of law. The plea of violation of natural justice also does not merit acceptance. When an appointment is secured by playing fraud, no equity can be claimed by the wrongdoer. Fraud unravels everything.

In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court has no hesitation in holding that the appointment of the petitioner was void ab initio. The action of the respondents in cancelling the same does not suffer from any legal infirmity. In the case of **Union of India & Ors. v. Prohlad Guha Etc.** reported in **2024 SCC Online SC 1865**, the Apex Court held that appointments secured on compassionate grounds through fraudulent documents are liable to be set aside. Similarly, in the case of **Vishnu Vardhan v. State of Uttar Pradesh And Others** reported in **2025 SCC**

Online SC 1501, the Apex Court reaffirmed that any judgment, order or appointment obtained by suppression of material facts or fraud cannot be sustained and is void ab initio. These decisions reaffirm the settled legal maxim that fraud vitiates everything.

The law is now well established that fraud vitiates every solemn act. An appointment procured by misrepresentation, forgery, or suppression of material facts is a nullity, conferring no lawful right on the appointee. Procedural safeguards reserved for validly appointed employees do not extend to protect appointments fundamentally tainted by fraud/concealment.

In the case of **District Collector & Chairman, Vizianagaram Social Welfare Residential School Society Vizianagaram And Another vs. M. Tripura Sundari Devi** reported in (1990) 3 SCC 655, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that an appointment founded on false information is void. Similarly in the case of **Union of India v. M. Bhaskaran** reported in (1995) Supp (4) SCC 100, the Apex Court has held that no regular disciplinary inquiry is necessary where entry into service itself is obtained by false documents. The Apex Court in the cases of **Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan v. Ram Ratan Yadav** reported in (2003) 3 SCC 437 as well as **R. Vishwanatha Pillai v. State of Kerala And Others** reported in (2004) 2 SCC 105, also affirm the doctrine that affiliation by fraud/concealment renders the appointment as void ab initio.

It is settled position of law that the annulled selections and appointments that were procured through large-scale manipulation, holding that no vestigial right can be derived from fraudulent appointment. The Court emphasized that the employer is empowered indeed obliged to cancel such appointments forthwith.

In another judgment passed in **Writ-A No.11846 of 2025 (Virendra Kumar Mishra vs. State of U.P. And 4 Others)** as decided on 19.8.2025, this Court has held that fraudulently obtained order of appointment or approval can be recalled by the authority concerned. In such cases merely because the employee continued in service for a number of years, on the basis of fraudulently obtained orders, cannot create any equity in his favour or any estoppel against the employer/authority. When an appointment or approval has been obtained by a person on the basis of forged documents, it would amount to misrepresentation and fraud on the employer. It would create no equity in his favour or any estoppel against the employer to cancel such appointment or approval since "Fraud and justice never dwell together."

Similarly, in the case of **Vishnu Vardhan (supra)**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court reiterated that fraud invalidates judicial and administrative actions alike, and that no procedural regularity can salvage an act obtained by fraud.

In the present case, the verification report clearly establishes that the petitioner had not disclosed about passing high school and intermediate twice and also could not explain his conduct for the same

The petitioner's plea that a regular departmental inquiry should have preceded cancellation is unsustainable. Once an appointment is shown to be procured by concealment of fact, the action of the authority is not a termination of service (which presupposes valid service) but a declaration that no valid appointment ever existed. The procedural protections under service rules for valid incumbents cannot be invoked to validate an appointment fundamentally corrupted by fraud.

It is a settled proposition of law that protection under Article 311 of the Constitution of India is available only to a person who has been validly and legally appointed to a civil post under the Union or a State. The constitutional safeguard presupposes a lawful entry into service. When an incumbent secures appointment by suppression of material facts, misrepresentation or by producing forged or fabricated certificates, such an appointment is void ab initio and confers no right to hold the post.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **R. Vishwanatha Pillai (supra)** as well as **M. Bhaskaran (supra)**, and other pronouncements has consistently held that fraud vitiates everything and that an appointment obtained by fraudulent means is non est in the eyes of law. In such circumstances, the individual never acquires the status of a government servant, and therefore cannot invoke the protection of Article 311 of Constitution of India. Termination of service in these cases is not a penalty attracting the requirement of a regular departmental inquiry but merely a declaration of the illegality of the very appointment itself. The plea that Article 311 mandates an inquiry before cancellation of such an appointment is wholly misconceived. Accordingly, it is held that where an appointment is obtained on the basis of fake or forged certificates, the employer is competent to cancel the same without holding any inquiry under Article 311 of the Constitution, as such an incumbent cannot claim any constitutional protection of tenure.

In the present case, the petitioner, by abusing the process of law by concealing material fact, has sought to usurp public employment which is meant to be offered only to deserving candidates. This Court cannot extend its discretionary jurisdiction to protect such a tainted appointment. The action of the authorities in cancelling the appointment of the petitioner, being in conformity with the settled principles of law, calls for no interference.

This Court is of the considered view that where a candidate has passed the High School Examination twice, the certificate which is to be taken into consideration shall ordinarily be the first validly obtained certificate, as the same constitutes the original and authentic record of educational

qualification as well as the date of birth.

The subsequent certificate, obtained upon re-appearing in the examination, may at best be treated as an improvement certificate for academic purposes, provided the concerned Board of Examination has duly recognized and endorsed it. However, for the purposes of public employment, service matters, or determination of age, the authorities are not bound to act upon the later certificate, especially if the same has been procured to alter the marks or manipulate the date of birth.

It is thus held that in absence of a specific statutory provision to the contrary, the first certificate shall prevail for all legal, service and official purposes, and the second attempt may only supplement but cannot supplant the original.

The judgment as cited by learned counsel for the petitioner is not applicable in the present facts of the case as it speaks about no bar in obtaining two parallel certificates of high school and intermediate whereas in the present case, the petitioner has passed high school and intermediate twice and has taken benefit of date of birth and enhanced marks placing the second mark-sheet of the high school and intermediate.

Even otherwise, this Court finds that the appointment letter itself contains a categorical stipulation that in the event, during scrutiny of the educational certificates, any fraud is detected or any concealment is established on the part of the petitioner, his appointment shall stand automatically cancelled without requiring any further act on the part of the authorities. Thus, the very foundation of the petitioner's appointment was conditional and subject to verification, and once the concealment and misrepresentation came to light, the cancellation of his appointment was the inevitable consequence flowing from the terms of his engagement.

In view of the above, the present petition lacks merit and is **dismissed**, accordingly.

(Mrs. Manju Rani Chauhan,J.)

September 10, 2025

Kalp Nath Singh