



2025:JHC-1 K03:296711

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - A No. - 10779 of 2025

Anjani Maurya And 7 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Secondary Edu. Lko
And 5 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Ghanshyam Verma, Subhanshu Mishra
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C., Abhishek Shukla, Jai Prakash Yadav, Rohit Kumar Sahu

Court No. - 18

HON'BLE SHREE PRAKASH SINGH, J.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, Mr. Amit Rai, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State, Mr. Jai Prakash Yadav, learned counsel for respondent no. 4 and perused the records.

By means of the present writ petition, the petitioners have challenged the orders dated 02.09.2025 and 16.07.2025 and submits that the Principal has passed the order for adjustment of the petitioners to another school and prior to this the order dated 16.07.2025 has also been passed, which is impugned herein, by virtue of which the District Inspector of Schools has passed the order while directing that the petitioners shall be adjusted in another institution.

The contention put forth by learned counsel appearing for the petitioners is that the Government Order dated 28.02.2024 is basically provides the provisions regarding the appointment of the employees by outsourcing agencies with it's their terms and conditions. He submitted that the government order does not prescribes any provisions regarding the adjustment of employees appointed/engaged by an outsourcing agency. He further argued that the order passed by the District Inspector of Schools and

the Principal of the Institution are stigmatic and that could not have been passed without affording proper opportunity of hearing to the petitioners. He submitted that acute prejudice is caused by the mandate of aforesaid orders, therefore, these orders are liable to be quashed.

On the other hand, learned counsels appearing for the State and for the College have opposed the contentions like anything and submitted that the conduct of the petitioners is such that they cannot be permitted to work in the institution. They submitted that the petitioners were allowed to join in the institution by the then Principal, which had no authority. They further submitted the order impugned, is not erroneous, thus, no interference is warranted.

Upon considering the submissions of counsel for the parties, it is apparent that the petitioners have been engaged through an outsourcing agency and thereafter, the some complaints were made against them and the District Inspector of Schools without affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioners, has passed the stigmatic order on 16.07.2025. Moreso, while passing the order dated 16.07.2025, the District Inspector of Schools has also directed that the petitioners shall be adjusted in another institutions, whereas, there is no provision in the Government Order dated 28.10.2022 issued in respect with the appointment/engagement of such employees by outsourcing agency.

In view of the aforesaid submissions and discussions, this Court finds that the orders dated 02.09.2025 and 16.07.2025 are unsustainable. Consequently, these are hereby quashed.

The matter is remitted back to the District Inspector of Schools, Ayodhya, to take a fresh decision after giving proper opportunity of hearing to the petitioners, within period of four weeks.

Consequences to follow.

The writ petition is **allowed** accordingly.

December 16, 2025

Mayank

(Shree Prakash Singh,J.)