HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 13350 of 2026

Dr Ranjana Vyas

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union Of India And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Arnav Dwivedi, Vivek Ratan Agrawal
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	A.S.G.I., Rohan Gupta, Sudarshan Singh

---

Court No. - 52

HON'BLE MRS. MANJU RANI CHAUHAN, J.

1. List revised. None appears on behalf of the respondent no.1 whereas learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Shivansh, Advocate holding brief of Sri Rohan Gupta, learned counsel for the respondent nos. 2 to 5 are present.

2. This writ petition has been filed *inter alia* for the following relief:-

"i) Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding and directing to the respondents to appoint the petitioner to the permanent post of Assistant Professor with the grant of appropriate seniority and consequential service benefits.

ii) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondents to decide the representation dated 22.05.2026 of the petitioner for appointment of the petitioner on the permanent post of Assistant Professor with the grant of appropriate seniority and consequential service benefits."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the issue in question has travelled up to the Hon'ble Apex Court in Civil Appeal No(S). 5307 of 2024 (Lokendra Kumar Tiwari vs. Union of India and Others), wherein the appeal was allowed by setting aside the impugned orders with the observation that regular appointment cannot be denied and the 32 vacant posts of Assistant Professor in the Institution as existing at the relevant point of time were to be considered in light of the advertisement issued in January, 2023. In this regard, the petitioner has moved a representation before respondent no. 3 on 22.05.2026 for consideration of his

appointment to the post of Assistant Professor along with the grant of appropriate seniority and consequential benefits. He lastly submits that a suitable direction may be issued to respondent no. 3 to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner in accordance with law.

4. Learned Standing Counsel for the respondents submits that no useful purpose would be served in keeping the writ petition pending and in case a fresh representation is being given before the respondent no.2, an appropriate direction may be issued to respondent no.2 to consider the grievance of the petitioner, in accordance with law.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and without going into the merits of the case and with the consent of the parties, the writ petition is **disposed of** with a direction to the petitioner to file a fresh representation before the respondent no.2, raising all his grievances along with all relevant documents within a period of three weeks from today. In case any such representation is filed by the petitioner, the respondent no.2 shall consider and decide the same in accordance with law, by reasoned and speaking order, preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of production of a certified copy of this order if there is no other legal impediment.

(Mrs. Manju Rani Chauhan,J.)

October 24, 2026
Junaid

Digitally signed by :-
JUNAID AHMAD
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad