

ITEM NO.19

COURT NO.5

SECTION XI

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).7498/2017

(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 05-07-2016 in SA No.430/2016 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad)

JAI KARAN SINGH

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF UP & ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 27636/2020 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

Date : 31-07-2023 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DIPANKAR DATTA

For Petitioner(s) Mr. S.R. Singh, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Sushant Kumar Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Ajay Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Prateek Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Mangal Prasad, Adv.
Mr. Gaurav Lomes, Adv.
Mr. Prithvi Yadav, Adv.
Ms. Aishwarya Singh, Adv.
Ms. Swapnil Singh, Adv.
Ms. Ananya Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Ankur Yadav, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mr. Ardhendumauli Prasad, A.A.G.
For R.No.1 Mr. Krishnanand Pandeya, AOR
Mr. Harshit Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Rakesh Mishra, AOR
Mr. Alok Kumar Pandey, Adv.
Ms. Kiran Pandey, Adv.
Mr. Raghvendra Upadhyay, Adv.
Ms. Poornima Jain, Adv.
Ms. Nishu Gupta, Adv.
Mr. Kislay Shukla, Adv.

Mr. Manoj K. Mishra, AOR
Mr. Umesh Dubey, Adv.
Mr. D N Dubey, Adv.

Mr. A Baskar, Adv.
Mr. Vishal, Adv.
Mr. Piyush Singh, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. Heard learned Senior Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, learned Additional Advocate General appearing on behalf of respondent No.1, (i.e., State of Uttar Pradesh), and learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.5 (i.e., Committee of Management), and carefully perused the material placed on record.
2. In our considered view, no case to interfere with the impugned judgment and order dated 05.07.2016, passed by the Division Bench of the High Court, dismissing the Writ Appeal filed against the order of the learned Single Judge, is made out.
3. There is concurrent finding of facts duly approved by the learned Single Judge and the Division Bench of the High Court that the petitioner was not appointed by a competent authority, he did not possess the requisite qualifications, his appointment was not approved by the competent authority, and his name did not figure in any authenticated document prepared by the Education Department after the institution was brought under the grants-in-aid scheme.
4. In light of the above-mentioned facts, no interference is called for.
5. The Special Leave Petition is, accordingly, dismissed.
6. As a result, pending interlocutory application also stand disposed of.

(SATISH KUMAR YADAV)
DEPUTY REGISTRAR

(PREETHI T.C.)
COURT MASTER (NSH)