



2025:AHC-1 KO:842501-DB

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - A No. - 14528 of 2025

Indrapal Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Addl. Chief Secy./Prin. Secy.
Home Deptt. Lko. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Ravi Pratap Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Shikhar Anand

Court No. - 2

**HON'BLE MRS. SANGEETA CHANDRA, J.
HON'BLE AMITABH KUMAR RAI, J.**

1. We have heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner at some length and Sri Prakhar Mishra, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel, who appears on behalf of the State Respondents.

2. This petition has been filed with the following main prayer:-

"issue, a writ order or direction in the nature of Certiorari quashing the impugned order dated 18.8.2025 passed by the opposite party No.2 as well as punishment order dated 5.3.2024, passed by the opposite party No.4 and consequential appellate order dated 6.5.2024, passed by the opposite party No.3, contained in AnnexureNo.1, 2 and 3 to this writ petition."

3. It is the case of the petitioner that he was transferred within the Central Zone from Police Station Kohana, Kanpur Nagar, to the post of Head Moharrir Malkhana at Anwarganj. However, he was not relieved immediately on 02.09.2023, he was in fact relieved at 20:22 hours on 19.09.2023 to join at Malkhana Anwarganj. As soon as he joined at Anwarganj, a fresh transfer order was issued, this time by the Headquarters, transferring him from Police Station Kohana to the Western Zone. The order dated 20.09.2023 came just within one day of his joining at Anwarganj. He went back to the Police Station Kohana and got his

ravangi done for Western Zone in terms of the transfer order dated 20.09.2023. This fact was disregarded by the respondents and a show-cause notice was issued to him making a false allegation that he misled Constable Jairam into believing that he had the permission of Arun Kumar, Inspector, Incharge of Police Station Kohana, whom he had talked with telephonically, and he again got his *ravangi* done from Police Station Kohana to West Zone in terms of the order dated 20.09.2023.

4. It is the case of the petitioner that he did not mislead anybody. He had in fact talked to the Inspector Incharge Arun Kumar over telephone. He had also called Sri Arun Kumar, when he went to P.S. Kohana for getting his *ravangi* for West Zone again making Constable Jairam, who was first present in Police Station Kohana talk personally to Inspector Incharge Arun Kumar. Only after personal contact with Inspector Incharge Arun Kumar, Constable Jairam has noted his *ravangi* at G.D maintained at Police Station Kohana.

5. In reply to a specific query made by this Court as to why the petitioner did not join at Anwarganj as he was relieved at 20:22 hours from Police Station Kohana vide G.D. No.46 recorded on 19.09.2023 and as to why did he come back to Police Station Kohana at 18:30 hours, learned Counsel for the petitioner has stated that 24 hours' time is granted to an employee after relieving to join at the transferred place of posting.

6. We are not convinced with the arguments made by learned Counsel for the petitioner as it is the petitioner's case and also G.D. Entry No.46 dated 19.09.2023 that he was relieved from Police Station Kohana to join at Anwarganj. Instead of joining at Anwarganj i.e. his transferred place of posting in terms of the local transfer order of the Deputy Commissioner, Central Kanpur Nagar, dated 02.09.2023, the petitioner remained at Police Station Kohana and came back to Police Station Kohana and then made out as if he had the permission of the Incharge Inspector Arun Kumar in getting his *ravangi* done again from Police Station Kohana to West Zone in terms of the transfer order dated 20.09.2023.

7. We also note that the transfer order dated 20.09.2023 has been issued by the Headquarters of the Commissionerate at Kanpur Nagar. This

transfer order superseded the earlier transfer order.

8. We have also considered the arguments raised by learned Counsel for the petitioner that the Tribunal has not appreciated the facts of the case in a proper manner and has also not appreciated the fact that the punishment order is non-speaking.

9. Learned Tribunal has considered this argument in paragraph-15 of its order. It is found that the punishment order had indicated the explanation given by the petitioner and had found to be frivolous and specious.

10. We find no good ground to show interference in the judgement and order dated 18.08.2025.

11. Consequently, the writ petition stands ***dismissed***.

(Amitabh Kumar Rai,J.) (Mrs. Sangeeta Chandra,J.)

December 16, 2025

Rahul