



2025:AHC:203399

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 20558 of 2024

Deepak Chowrasia

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : In Person

Counsel for Respondent(s) : Shambhavi Tiwari, C.S.C., Rohit Pandey

A.F.R

Court No. - 32

ORAL ORDER.

HON'BLE SAURABH SHYAM SHAMSHERY, J.

1. Heard Sri Deepak Chowrasia, petitioner in person and Sri Rohit Pandey on behalf of respondents.
2. Court is repeatedly facing difficulty in dealing cases of petitioners appearing in person since their writ petitions invariably remains defective. Even averments made therein are not proper, since they are unaware of law and procedure and normally they refuse to take services of an Amicus Curaie.
3. Due to lack of proper assistance even though Court gave patient hearing, interest of justice suffers.
4. It is necessary to observe that there is no bar for petitioner in person to file a petition and to argue their case. In some case they argue better than any qualified Advocate, but it is an exception.
5. The present case is also an example of such defective writ petition. On one hand petitioner wants to quash an order, whereby his contractual appointment was extended, thus acting against his own interest and on other hand after participating in a selection process when he remained unsuccessful, has challenged selection of other persons without even impleading them. Thus writ petition is defective.

Petitioner has arrayed 'Selection Committee' as one of the respondent, which is also a defect.

6. This writ petition is pending since 2024 and at the outset when this Court requested the petitioner appearing in person to appoint an Amicus Curaie, he bluntly refused.

7. Court also takes note of a submission of learned counsel for the University that presently there is no contractual appointment in the University on the post of Lecturer and are appointed through a proper recruitment process.

8. A reference of G.O. by petitioner in person would not help him since it has no statutory backup otherwise a contractual appointee has no indefeasible right for extension specifically when regular appointments are already been made.

9. Reference of many judgments in Writ Petition does not make a case better, if facts are against.

10. Court cannot help such writ petitioner appearing in person on basis of defective writ petition, making prayers contrary to law, accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed, with a cost of Rs.5000/- to be deposited by the petitioner in person in the District Legal Services Authority, Kanpur Nagar.

(Saurabh Shyam Shamshery,J.)

November 15, 2025

SB