



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 22590 of 2026

Dashrath Yadav

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of Uttar Pradesh And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Jalaj Singh, Rajneesh Kumar Srivastava, Shashank Pandey, Vinod Kumar Jaiswal
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: Udayan Nandan, C.S.C., Prakhar Saran Srivastava

Court No. - 1

HON'BLE AJIT KUMAR, J.

HON'BLE GARIMA PRASHAD, J.

1. Heard Sri Ashish Kumar Singh, learned Senior Counsel, assisted by Sri Rajneesh Kumar Srivastava and Sri Raj Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri Prakhar Saran, Sri S.K. Singh and Sri Tej Singh, learned counsel for respondent no. 2, Sri Udayan Nandan, learned counsel for the Dedicated Commission, and Sri Manish Goyal, learned Additional Advocate General, assisted by Sri A.K. Goyal, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State.

2. We have gone through the affidavits filed on behalf of the Commission and find that certain questionnaires were prepared for obtaining the requisite data regarding the economic and political backwardness of different castes within the class of OBCs, so that the object, as emerging from the judgment of the Supreme Court, could be achieved.

3. Sri Udayan Nandan submits that 60% of the data collection work has been completed, covering 40 districts. The remaining 40%, pertaining to the remaining districts, will also be completed soon. Upon examining the records as has been placed before us and affidavit filed stated to have been completed, particularly the notices published in widely circulated daily newspapers and the questionnaires were issued to persons who is approached the Commission during its visits to different districts but we find that the number of persons who appeared before the Commission on the dates its meetings were held far fewer than required to obtain the requisite data. Taking Agra as an example, we find that despite the notices issued, only a very 179 small number of persons out of total OBC population of 3 lacs and above, appeared before the Commission, and

even though questionnaires were issued to all only statement of 29 persons were recorded, so not even of all 179 persons.

4. The Commission has been undertaking this exercise for nearly five months. It is, therefore, necessary to understand how it has proceeded so far and how it proposes to assess the backwardness of different castes within the OBCs for preparation of its report. It is stated before us that the Advisory Committee, constituted soon after the constitution of the Commission, has not held any meeting with the Commission till date. Its first meeting is scheduled for 12.10.2026. The data collected so far would naturally be discussed at that meeting. At this stage, we wish to examine the work undertaken in respect of one district, taking Agra as an example.

5. Let the Commission place before us a statement of the work undertaken so far in respect of district Agra. The statement shall explain the manner in which the Commission has proceeded, the caste-wise empirical data collected regarding social, economic and political backwardness of OBC, and how it proposes to assess and present that material in its report in terms of the order passed by the Supreme Court in the case of *Dr. K. Krishna Murthy & Ors. v. Union of India and Another* [(2010) 7 SCC 202] and later judgement in the case of *Suresh Mahajan Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh and another* (2022) 12 SCC 770. This will enable us to understand how the Commission proposes to proceed with the exercise across the districts to complete the work with the time frame of six months provided to it. The statement shall be placed before us in a sealed cover.

6. The **report** shall be placed before us on or before 14.10.2026.

7. Put up on 14.10.2026, at 12:00 noon for further hearing as arguments are to be advanced on behalf of the petitioner.

October 9, 2026

Lbm/-

(Garima Prashad,J.) (Ajit Kumar,J.)