2026:AHC:211544-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 14184 of 2026

Dinesh Kumar Verma

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Ankur Mishra, Devansh Misra, Shiv Shanker Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 21

HON'BLE ARINDAM SINHA, J.
HON'BLE INDRAJEET SHUKLA, J.

1. Mr. Devansh Mishra, learned advocate appears for petitioner and submits, his client has challenged judgement and order dated 09th June, 2026 of the Tribunal. It was on late disclosure of his assets, being a government servant. There were minor and major penalties awarded. Against the penalties his client filed claim petition before the Tribunal. By impugned judgement and order the major penalties were set aside but minor penalty of censure entry, confirmed. His client has, therefore, to that extent challenged said judgement and order.

2. On query Mr. Mishra submits, there was initially requisition upon his client to make the declaration. He refers to one of the reasoning paragraphs in impugned judgement and order, reproduced below.

> "आरोप सं0-4 में इस तथ्य का उल्लेख किया गया है कि याची व्दारा अपने चल-अचल सम्पत्ति की सूचना दस वर्षों बाद दी गयी। सामान्य तौर पर निर्धारित समयावधि में चल-अचल सम्पत्ति की सूचना दिया जाना किसी भी राजकीय कार्मिक का दायित्व है किन्तु इस सम्बन्ध में यह भी तथ्य है कि कार्मिक विभाग व्दारा इस आशय के शासनादेश समय-समय पर निर्गत किये जाते हैं कि यदि किसी कार्मिक व्दारा निर्धारित समय सीमा के अन्तर्गत चल-अचल सम्पत्ति की सूचना नहीं दी गयी है तो उसे वेतन वृद्धि, पदोन्नति व अन्य सेवा लाभ नहीं दिये जायेंगे। प्रस्तुत प्रकरण में विभाग ने ऐसा कोई उपबन्ध किया है वह पत्रावली से ध्वनित नहीं हो रहा है।"

He relies on above finding of the Tribunal that relevant Government Orders (GOs) were not intimated to his client. In the circumstances, it cannot be said his client is guilty since declaration was made, though

belatedly. The award of minor punishment was bad. He seeks interference.

3. Dr. D.K. Tiwari, learned advocate, Additional Chief Standing Counsel appears for State. He opposes the writ petition. The Tribunal upon hearing petitioner and giving reasons passed impugned judgement and order. There be no interference.

4. There does not appear to be any dispute that petitioner was initially under requisition to make the declaration. He did not. On further query we have ascertained, no further notice or communication was made, which prompted petitioner to belatedly disclose. In the circumstances, there was omission on part of petitioner. The Tribunal has maintained the minor punishment of censure entry. It is not based on any reasoning which we find to be perverse.

5. Mr. Mishra submits there be observation made recording that State has supported impugned judgement and order. On query Mr. Tiwari submits, he does not have instruction that there has been step taken to challenge it.

6. There is no merit in the writ petition. It is dismissed.

(Arindam Sinha,J.)

(Indrajeet Shukla,J.)

October 8, 2026
S.P.

Digitally signed by :-
SANJAY PURI
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad