



2025:0004-1 K03:097006

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - A No. - 13993 of 2025

Vinay Kant Gautam

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Rural Development
Lko. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Sachin Kumar Pandey, Mirza Ataulla Beg
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C.

Court No. - 7

HON'BLE MANISH MATHUR, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for petitioner and Mr. Sudhir Kumar Singh, learned State Counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite parties.
2. Supplementary affidavit filed today is taken on record.
3. Present petition under Article 226 of Constitution of India has been filed challenging order dated 14.11.2025 whereby petitioner currently on the post of Gram Panchayat Secretary has been placed under suspension.
4. It has been submitted that a perusal of impugned order will make it evident that primary allegations have been levelled against the Mate who was required to upload photographs pertaining to work being conducted. He has also adverted to fact that upon coming to know of the incorrect uploading of such photographs, petitioner himself issued a notice on 06.11.2025 to the said Mate indicating incorrect uploading of photographs. It is thus submitted that it is in fact petitioner who was responsible for indicating error in 'View Daily Attendance' whereas inspection which forms the basis of petitioner's suspension took place subsequently on 07.11.2025. It is also submitted that since the work was required to be performed from 01.11.2025 till 14.11.2025, it is only upon completion of aforesaid work that petitioner was required to authenticate attendance of the

workers.

5. Learned State Counsel has refuted the submissions advanced by learned counsel for petitioner with submission that as per Government Order dated 30.07.2025, it is in fact the responsibility of petitioner as Secretary of Gram Panchayat to authenticate the uploaded attendance on the same day itself. It is submitted that petitioner therefore has been unable to explain as to why notice was issued after six days of work having commenced.

6. Upon consideration of submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties and perusal of material on record, the entire dispute revolves around the aspect whether petitioner was required to authenticate the uploaded 'View Daily Attendance' daily or upon completion of the work after 14 days and whether due to some extra ordinary circumstance, was unable to authenticate the same.

7. In the considered opinion of this Court, the aforesaid aspect would require delving into disputed questions of facts, which would not be appropriate for a writ Court to adjudicate upon at the stage of examination of validity of the suspension order.

8. Since charge sheet has already been issued to petitioner, it shall be open for petitioner to reply the same within the time-frame granted.

9. Opposite parties are required to conclude the enquiry proceedings expeditiously.

10. With aforesaid direction(s), the petition stands finally **disposed of** .

(Manish Mathur,J.)

December 16, 2025

kvg/-