



2026:AHC-LKO:73475-DB

A.F.R.
Reserved on 03.08.2026
Delivered on 12.10.2026

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - A No. - 3307 of 2026

Pankaj Kumar and 9 others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.P. Thru. Prin./ Addl.Chief Secy. Deptt. of Food Safety Drug
Administration and Ors.

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Mayankar Singh,
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C., A.S.G.I., Alok Mishra, Ambrish Rai, Priyanshu Shukla, Rakesh Kumar, Utsav Mishra, Virendra Mishra

Court No. - 5

HON'BLE ALOK MATHUR, J.
HON'BLE AMITABH KUMAR RAI, J.

(Delievered by Hon'ble Amitabh Kumar Rai, J)

1. Heard Sri Mayankar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioners, Sri Rajesh Tiwari, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State-respondents; and Sri Utsav Mishra, learned counsel for respondent No. 3 as well as Sri Alok Mishra, learned counsel for intervenors.

2. The instant writ petition has been filed challenging the vires of Rule 8(2) of the Uttar Pradesh

Food Safety and Drug Administration Department Analysts (Food and Drug Laboratory) Service Rules, 2017, as amended by the First Amendment Rules, 2020 [*hereinafter referred to as "the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020)"*]. Further challenge has been made to paragraph 6 of Advertisement No. 4/2024 dated 21.02.2024, issued by respondent No. 3, i.e., the U.P. Subordinate Services Selection Commission, to the extent that it prescribes the eligibility qualification for appointment to the post of Junior Analyst (Food) by providing only for a Master's Degree in Chemistry, Biochemistry, Microbiology, Dairy Chemistry, Food Technology and Nutrition or a degree in Veterinary Sciences thereby excluding persons possessing a Bachelor's Degree in Food Technology/ Dairy Technology/ Oil Technology/ Biotechnology.

3. The relief sought is also for a direction commanding the respondents to treat a B.Tech. degree in Food Technology/ Dairy Technology/ Oil Technology/Biotechnology, etc., and allied disciplines, as an eligible qualification for selection to the post of Junior Analyst (Food) in the Department of Food Safety and Drug Administration, Government of U.P.

4. The thrust of the challenge to amended Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) is based on the eligibility qualification prescribed under the Food Safety and Standards Rules, 2011 (*hereinafter referred to as "the Rules of 2011"*), which, vide Rule 2.1.4, provides the qualification for the post of Food Analyst. It provides that a person shall not be

qualified for appointment as a Food Analyst under the Act unless he/she holds a Master's or Doctorate Degree in Chemistry, Biochemistry, Microbiology, Dairy Chemistry, Agriculture Science, Animal Science, Fisheries Science, Biotechnology, Food Safety, Food Technology or Bachelor Degree in Food and Nutrition, Dairy Technology, Oil Technology or Veterinary Sciences from a university established in India by law, or is an Associate of the Institution of Chemists (India) by examination in the section of Food Analysts conducted by the Institution of Chemists (India), or possesses any other equivalent qualification notified by the Food Authority with the prior approval of the Central Government and has not less than three years' experience in the analysis of food.

5. It has been argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that once the eligibility qualification has been fixed by the Central Government prescribing the qualification for the post of Food Analyst, the State Government cannot adopt a different criterion while fixing the eligibility qualification. Hence, Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) being in variance with Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011, cannot be sustained and is liable to be struck down.

6. It has been submitted that the Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as "**the Act of 2006**") under Section 45, empowers the Commissioner of Food Safety to appoint such persons as he thinks fit, having the qualification prescribed by the Central Government to be Food Analysts for such local

areas as may be assigned to them by the Commissioner of Food Safety.

7. It has also been submitted that the Rules of 2011 have been framed in exercise of the powers under Section 91 of the Act of 2006, whereby the Central Government has made rules prescribing qualifications for the post of Food Analyst and hence the State Government cannot prescribe any eligibility qualification for appointment to the said post which is different from or at variance with the eligibility qualifications fixed under the Rules of 2011 framed by the Central Government.

8. It has been submitted that the State Government framed rules in exercise of the powers under the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India, namely, the Uttar Pradesh Food Safety and Drug Administration Department Analysts (Food and Drug Laboratory) Service Rules, 2017 (hereinafter referred to as "**the Rules of 2017**"), which provided the qualification for appointment to the post of Junior Analyst (Food) including the qualification of a Bachelor's Degree in Science with Chemistry as one of the subjects, or a Bachelor's Degree in Food Technology from a university established in India by law, or a qualification recognised by the Government as equivalent thereto.

9. The aforesaid qualifications prescribed in the Rules of 2017 framed by the State Government were amended by notification dated 07.08.2020 by way of the First Amendment Rules, 2020, providing for an academic qualification of a Master's Degree in Chemistry, Biochemistry, Microbiology, Dairy Chemistry, Food

Technology, Food and Nutrition, or a Bachelor of Technology in Food/Dairy/Oil, or a Degree in Veterinary Sciences, or an equivalent degree from a university established in India by law, or a qualification recognised by the Government as equivalent thereto. Thus, the State Government, by amending the Rules in the year 2020, excluded the academic qualification of Bachelor's Degree except in Veterinereery Science while retaining new academic qualification requiring Master's Degree as above resulting in the exclusion of the petitioners from the zone of eligibility for selection to the post of Junior Analyst (Food).

10. It has been submitted that an advertisement dated 21.02.2024 was issued providing for appointment to 417 posts of Junior Analyst (Food) under the Food Safety and Drug Administration Department, Government of U.P., prescribing the qualification as introduced by the First Amendment Rules, 2020 to the Rules of 2017. However, the petitioners, who otherwise are qualified under the Rules of 2011 framed by the Central Government and under the unamended Rules of 2017 framed by the State Government, now stand excluded from the zone of eligibility after the First Amendment Rules, 2020.

11. It has been submitted that prescribing a qualification by the State Government for the post of Junior Analyst (Food) different from the qualification prescribed by the Central Government for the post of Food Analyst is violative of Article 254 of the Constitution of India, inasmuch as the Rules of 2011 were framed in

exercise of the power under Section 91 of the Act of 2006, which is a Central legislation and the rules framed by the State Government have to be in conformity with the law enacted by Parliament. It has been submitted that Rule 8(2), as inserted by the First Amendment Rules, 2020 in the Rules of 2017 made by the State Government under the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India, lacks competence as the State Government cannot transgress upon the power prescribed for the Central Government.

12. Reliance has been placed on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 20.03.2025 passed in **Civil Appeal No. 10389 of 2024, Chandra Shekhar Singh & Others v. State of Jharkhand & Others**, to submit that in the matter of appointment of Food Safety Officers, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the scope of the powers to be exercised by the State Government is limited only to the extent of formulating modalities for carrying out the functions and duties assigned to the Food Safety Officer and does not permit the State Government to transgress into the field of prescribing qualifications for the post of Food Safety Officer, which lies within the exclusive domain of the Central Government as per the mandate of the Act of 2006.

13. It has been submitted that a Division Bench of this Court, in the matter of appointment of **Drug Inspectors under the Act of 2006 in Writ-A No. 8721 of 2022, Ashish Tyagi and 7 Others v. State of U.P. and Others**, along with Special Appeal No. 163

of 2021, U.P. Public Service Commission, Prayagraj v. Ashish Tyagi and Others, has declared Rule 8(ii)(a) to (c) of the Uttar Pradesh Food and Drug Administration Department Gazetted Officers' (Drugs) Service (Third Amendment) Rules, 2015, as ultra vires as the qualifications prescribed therein was not in conformity with the Rule 49 of Drug and Cosmetic Rules, 1945 framed by Central Government in exercise of power under Section 33(2)(b) read with Section 21(1) of the Drugs and Cosmetic Act, 1940.

14. Thus, it has been submitted that in view of the settled proposition of law in the aforesaid judgments and in view of the fact that the academic qualification prescribed by the State Government vide the First Amendment Rules, 2020 to the Rules of 2017 is not in conformity with the Rules of 2011 framed by the Central Government, there is an express violation of Article 254 of the Constitution of India. Hence, the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) deserve to be declared ultra vires and the writ petition deserves to be allowed.

15. Sri Rajesh Tiwari, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel, on the other hand, submitted that the provisions of the Act of 2006 came into force on different dates ranging from 15.10.2007 till 18.08.2010 and the Act of 2006 was fully enforced with effect from 05.08.2011 after issuance of the notification dated 04.08.2011 under Section 97(1) of the Act of 2006, by which enactments and orders contained in Schedule II, including the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954

(hereinafter referred to as "**the Act of 1954**") were repealed.

16. It has also been submitted that Section 98 of the Act of 2006 preserved the rules and regulations which were in operation earlier until the new standards were specified regulating the standards and safety requirements under the Act of 2006. It has further been submitted that prior to the implementation of the Act of 2006 and the Rules of 2011, the State Government had already framed rules under the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India for the employees working in the Directorate of Medical and Health Services, State of U.P., which was the competent department under the Prevention of Food Adulteration Act of 1954, to regulate the quality, standards and safety of food and drugs.

17. It has also been submitted that the State Government framed the rules, namely, the Uttar Pradesh Medical and Health Department Analysts (Public Analyst/Insecticide Analyst and Government Analyst, Laboratory) Service Rules, 2006, governing the service conditions for the posts of Senior Analytical Assistant (Food) and Junior Analytical Assistant (Food), with the qualifications prescribed therein at that point of time. Subsequently, the State Government, vide Government Order dated 17.04.2009, bifurcated the Food and Drug Department from the Medical and Health Department and the posts sanctioned in the Food and Drugs Section were merged in the Directorate of Food and Drugs Administration. Accordingly, the posts of Senior Analytical Assistant (Food) and Junior Analytical Assistant (Food)

were merged in the Directorate of Food and Drug Administration and the nomenclature of the posts was changed to Senior Analyst (Food) and Junior Analyst (Food).

18. It has been submitted that under the Act of 1954 reference was made to the post of Public Analyst, nomenclature of which was later changed to Food Analyst. By notification dated 05.08.2011 issued under Section 30 of the Act of 2006, the Commissioner, Food Safety and Drug Administration, was notified to exercise the powers of the Commissioner of Food Safety. It has been submitted that the posts of Junior Analyst (Food) and Senior Analyst (Food) having different nomenclature were, in fact, in existence prior to the enforcement of the Act of 2006 and the Rules of 2011 framed by the Central Government.

19. It has been submitted that the posts of Junior Analyst (Food) and Senior Analyst (Food) were not created under the Act of 2006 and that their origin lies in the pre-existing State Laboratory Services governed by the Uttar Pradesh Medical and Health Department Analysts (Public Analyst/Insecticide Analyst and Government Analyst, Laboratory) Service Rules, 2006, framed under the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India. The aforesaid Service Rules contained the substantive posts of Junior Analytical Assistant (Food) and Senior Analytical Assistant (Food), which existed independently of the subsequent Central statutory framework under the Act of 2006.

20. Based on the aforesaid facts, learned counsel for the State submits that the historical and statutory precedents clearly establish that Junior Analyst was never created as a junior statutory category of Food Analyst under the State cadre post and the statutory appointment under the Act of 2006 have separate legal identities from the post of Food Analyst referred to in Section 45 of the Act of 2006.

21. It has been submitted that the First Amendment Rules, 2020, notified on 07.08.2020, amending the Rules of 2017, prescribed academic qualifications of a Master's Degree in Chemistry, Biochemistry, Microbiology, Dairy Chemistry, Food Technology or Food and Nutrition, or a Degree in Veterinary Science, or a qualification recognised by the Government as equivalent thereto, for direct recruitment to the post of Junior Analyst. The amended Rules had been in existence for nearly four years before the issuance of Advertisement No. 04 of 2024 dated 21.02.2024 and it was not introduced for the first time at the time of recruitment while issuing the advertisement dated 21.02.2024. It has been submitted that the constitutional power conferred by the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India empowers the State Government to make rules, classify posts and prescribe the source and method of recruitment, including prescribing qualifications for the posts.

22. It has been submitted that the Rules of 2017 framed by the State Government are under the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India and were not

framed under Section 94 of the Act of 2006. It has also been submitted that Section 94 of the Act of 2006 empowers the State Government to make rules for carrying out the functions and duties assigned to the State Government and the Commissioner of Food Safety under the Act of 2006, which cannot be construed as denuding the State Government of its power to frame service rules under the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India to regulate State public services. Accordingly, it has been argued that the State is not precluded from prescribing qualifications for the post of Junior Analyst (Food).

23. It has been submitted that the Act of 2006 cannot be construed as an exhaustive service code governing the entire administrative, technical, or laboratory posts which are to be maintained by the State Government for the proper and complete implementation of the provisions contained in the Act of 2006. The Act of 2006 creates and regulates specified statutory functionaries, whereas the constitution of the supporting departmental establishment, creation of posts and prescription of qualifications for such posts continue to remain within the constitutional domain of the State Government. Reference has also been made by learned counsel for the State to the judgment of the High Court of Kerala in ***B. Sudharma and Others v. State of Kerala and Others*, 2021 SCC OnLine Ker 522**, to submit that the State Government is competent to create posts to regulate the duties cast upon it under the Act of 2006.

24. It has been submitted that the post of Food Analyst under Section 45 of the Act of 2006 is a statutory appointment for which the Central Government prescribes qualifications under Section 91(2)(e) of the Act of 2006 read with Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011, whereas Junior Analyst (Food) is a separate substantive post in the Uttar Pradesh laboratory cadre governed by Rules 5 and 8(2) of the Rules of 2017. Accordingly, it has been argued that the prescription of qualification for the statutory appointment of Food Analyst cannot automatically govern recruitment to the distinct State cadre post of Junior Analyst.

25. It has further been stated that the argument of learned counsel for the petitioner placing reliance upon Article 254 of the Constitution of India is misplaced, as it is based on the erroneous assumption that amended Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 and Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 framed by the Central Government operate upon the same subject and in the same legal field. It has been submitted that, in fact, the two provisions relate to distinct posts and that the State cadre post is that of Junior Analyst, whereas Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 refers to the post of Food Analyst.

26. It has also been submitted that the Uttar Pradesh Subordinate Services Selection Commission sought clarification regarding equivalent qualifications through its communication dated 04.11.2022 and the Department responded thereto on 01.06.2023, prior to issuance of Advertisement No. 04 of 2024. The recruitment requisition thereafter proceeded on the

qualification prescribed under amended Rule 8(2). The Government Order dated 19.07.2023 relied upon by the petitioners concerns the administrative procedure for consideration of equivalence. The said Government Order does not, by itself, declare B.Tech in Food Technology, Dairy Technology, Oil Technology, Biotechnology or allied disciplines equivalent to the qualification prescribed under amended Rule 8(2). The office orders dated 06.08.2025 and 07.08.2025 issued by the Women Welfare or Women Development Department concern posts administered by another department. A determination made by another department with reference to its own cadre, duties and functional requirements cannot automatically bind the Food Safety and Drug Administration Department.

27. It has been submitted that the advertisement No. 04 of 2024 dated 21.02.2024 was issued for recruitment to 417 posts of Junior Analyst (Food) on the basis of amended Rule 8(2) of the Uttar Pradesh Service Rules, 2017. Even assuming that the online application interface or pre-filled qualification menu displayed certain B.Tech qualifications, such electronic or administrative entry could neither amend the statutory Service Rules nor enlarge the qualification prescribed thereunder. A Rule framed under the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India cannot be altered by an online portal, clerical discrepancy or automated acceptance of an application form, and there can be no estoppel against a statutory recruitment Rule. Acceptance of an online application, issuance of an admit card, participation in the written examination or calling a candidate for document

verification does not amount to a final determination of eligibility. The purpose of document verification is to scrutinise whether the candidate satisfies the qualification prescribed under the governing Service Rules. The undertaking obtained at the stage of document verification merely preserved the provisional nature of candidature and the authority of the competent Government to determine eligibility in accordance with the statutory Rule. The said undertaking could not confer eligibility contrary to amended Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017.

28. He has further submitted that the conduct of the petitioners is material while considering the discretionary jurisdiction of this Hon'ble Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The First Amendment Rules, 2020 were notified on 07.08.2020 and Advertisement No. 04 of 2024 dated 21.02.2024 proceeded on the qualification prescribed under amended Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017. The petitioners nevertheless submitted their applications, accepted the conditions of the advertisement, participated in the written examination and continued in the selection until the stage of document verification. Their substantive challenge was pursued only when their eligibility came to be tested against the governing statutory Rule. A candidate cannot ordinarily approbate and reprobate in relation to the same selection process. Having elected to participate under the notified Service Rules and having taken the chance of selection, the petitioners cannot accept the procedure insofar as it permits their

participation and repudiate the governing qualification when the same operates against them. The petitioners cannot simultaneously rely upon the advertisement and selection process for the benefits derived therefrom and disown the statutory eligibility condition forming the legal foundation of the same recruitment.

29. Learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel has submitted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Tajvir Singh Sodhi and Others v. State of Jammu and Kashmir and Others, 2023 INSC 309***, while considering a challenge raised by unsuccessful candidates to recruitment for the posts of Drug Inspector, has held that candidates who participate in a selection process without protest cannot challenge the same after the result operates against them and cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time. Reliance has been placed on findings recorded in paragraphs 13.1 and 13.2 of the judgment quoted below :-

".....39. It is therefore trite that candidates, having taken part in the selection process without any demur or protest, cannot challenge the same after having been declared unsuccessful. The candidates cannot approbate and reprobate at the same time. In other words, simply because the result of the selection process is not palatable to a candidate, he cannot allege that the process of interview was unfair or that there was some lacuna in the process. Therefore, we find that the writ petitioners in these cases, could not have questioned before a Court of law, the rationale behind recasting the

selection criteria, as they willingly took part in the selection process even after the criteria had been so recast. Their candidature was not withdrawn in light of the amended criteria. A challenge was thrown against the same only after they had been declared unsuccessful in the selection process, at which stage, the challenge ought not to have been entertained in light of the principle of waiver and acquiescence.

40. This Court in Sadananda Halo has noted that the only exception to the rule of waiver is the existence of mala fides on the part of the Selection Board. In the present case, we are unable to find any mala fide or arbitrariness in the selection process and therefore the said exception cannot be invoked."

30. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties, the issues that fall for consideration before this Court are as follows :-

(i) Whether the post of Junior Analyst (Food) referred to in the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) is at par with the post of Food Analyst as mentioned in Section 45 of the Act, 2006 so as to attract repugnancy with regard to the academic qualifications laid down for the aforesaid posts by the State Government while framing Rules under the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India and the Rules, 2011 framed by the Central Government in exercise of the powers under Section 91 of the Act, 2006.

(ii) Whether Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) is in derogation of Regulation 2.1.4

of the Rules of 2011 framed in exercise of the powers under Section 91 of the Act of 2006, and, as such, is ultra vires to Article 254 of the Constitution of India;

(iii) Whether the petitioners, having participated in the selection process without demur, can subsequently challenge the selections;

31. While deciding the first issue it would be necessary to go through the scheme of the Act of 2006 which refers to the post of Food Analyst in Section 45 of the Act of 2006. Section 45 of the Act of 2006 is reproduced hereinbelow :-

"45. Food Analysts.- *The Commissioner of Food Safety may, by notification, appoint such persons as he thinks fit, having the qualifications prescribed by the Central Government, to be Food Analysts for such local areas as may be assigned to them by the Commissioner of Food Safety;*

Provided that no person, who has any financial interest in the manufacture or sale of any article of food shall be appointed to be a Food Analyst under this section:

Provided further that different Food Analysts may be appointed for different articles of food."

32. The Central Government has framed the Rules of 2011 prescribing for the post of Food Analyst under Rule 2.1.4. For ready reference Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 is also quoted hereinbelow :-

"2.1.4: Food Analyst

1. Qualification : A person shall not be qualified for appointment as Food Analyst under the Act unless she/ he :-

(i) [holds a Bachelor's or Master's or Doctorate degree in Chemistry or Biochemistry or microbiology or Dairy Chemistry or Agriculture Science or Animal Science or Fisheries Science or Biotechnology or Food safety or Food Technology, Food and Nutrition or Dairy Technology or Oil Technology or Veterinary Sciences from a university established in India by law or is an associate of the Institution of Chemists (India) by examination in the section of Food Analysts conducted by the Institution of Chemists (India) or any other equivalent qualification notified by the Food Authority with the prior approval of the Central Government and has not less than three years' experience in the analysis of food; and]⁴

(ii) Has been declared qualified for appointment as a Food Analyst by a board appointed and notified by the Authority

Notwithstanding anything contained above,

(a) any person who has been declared qualified for appointment as Public Analyst by the board constituted under Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954 shall also be eligible for holding the post of Food Analyst.

(b) any person who is a Public Analyst under the provisions of Prevention of Food Adulteration Act, 1954 on the

date of commencement of these Rules, may hold office of the Food Analyst subject to the terms and conditions of service applicable to such person.

A person appointed as Food Analyst shall undergo all specialized training programmes specified by the Food Authority periodically.

2. Duties:

(i) The Food Analyst shall analyse or cause to be analysed the article of food sent to him for analysis. In analyzing the article of food, the Food Analyst shall follow such instructions and shall adhere to such procedure as adopted by the Food Authority from time to time. The report of analysis shall be signed by the Food Analyst.

(ii) After completion of analysis of article of food, the Food Analyst shall send his report to the Designated Officer, the Purchaser of article of food, as the case may be, in Form VII A."

33. A bare perusal of the aforesaid Rules indicates that apart from the academic qualifications and three years' experience, there has to be a declaration by a Board appointed by the Food Safety and Standards Authority of India (*hereinafter referred to as "**FSSAI**"*) declaring a person to be qualified for appointment as a Food Analyst. Unless a person is declared qualified for appointment as a Food Analyst by such Board, he cannot be held to be qualified for holding the post of Food Analyst. The FSSAI has already notified the Board as required under sub-rule (1)(ii) of Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 by constituting the said Board. Vide Notification

No. QA-11022/1/2021-QA-FSSAI dated 10.09.2021, the FSSAI has constituted the Board. The said notification is reproduced hereinbelow :-

**"FOOD SAFETY AND STANDARDS
AUTHORITY OF INDIA**

NOTIFICATION

New Delhi, the 10th September, 2021

*F. No. QA-11022/1/2021-QA-FSSAI —
In exercise of the powers conferred
under the sub-rule 1(ii) of rule 2.1.4 of
the Food Safety and Standards Rule,
2011, and in supersession of the Food
Safety and Standards Authority of India
(FSSAI) notification number
F.No.10/QA/FA Exam/FSSAI 2016 dated
28th August, 2019, Published in the
Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part-
III, Section-4, except as respects things
done or omitted to be done before such
supersession, the Food Safety and
Standards Authority of India hereby
appoints a board comprising of the
following members for the purpose of
considering the candidates suitable and
qualified to hold the post of Food
Analyst under the provisions of the
Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006
(34 of 2006) and the rules made
thereunder, namely:-*

- i. Chief Executive Officer, Food Safety
and Standards Authority of India –
Chairman*
- ii. Executive Director (HR), Food Safety
and Standards Authority of India –
Member*

iii. Advisor (Science & Standards), Food Safety and Standards Authority of India – Member

iv. Advisor (Quality Assurance), Food Safety and Standards Authority of India - Member Secretary

v. Chief Technology Officer, Food Safety and Standards Authority of India – Member

vi. Director, National Food Laboratory, Ghaziabad- Member

vii. Dean, Post Graduate Studies, National Institute of Food Technology Entrepreneurship and Management, Kundli – Member

viii. Chief Scientist and Head, FSAQCL (Director RFL) – Central Food Technological Research Institute, Mysuru- Member

ix. Associate Dean and Principal, College of Food Technology, Vasantrao Naik Marathwada Agricultural University, Parbhani, Maharashtra- Member.

2. The Board may co-opt experts or officers for such purpose as it deems fit.

3. This board shall regulate its own procedure and the conduct of business to be transacted by it.

4. In case of any difficulty/dispute, the decision of the chairman of the board shall be final.

5. No act of proceeding of the board shall be called in questions on the ground merely of existence of any vacancy in as or any defect in the constitution of the Board.

ARUN SINGHAL, Chief Executive Officer
[ADVT.-III/4/Exty./255/2021-22]"

34. The FSSAI regularly conducts examinations for Junior Analyst and Food Analyst from time to time for the purpose of granting certificates, which is evident from the notice dated 22.06.2023 annexed with the writ petition as Annexure No.7 by the petitioner himself. The said notification dated 22.06.2023 indicates that a test is conducted by the FSSAI for granting a certificate of Junior Analyst and those who qualify in the Junior Analyst examination and hold a Junior Analyst certificate issued by the FSSAI, after having acquired three years' experience, are eligible to appear in the practical examination conducted for being declared qualified as Food Analyst under the Rules of 2011.

35. The opportunity to appear in the said examination for Food Analyst is available to a qualified Junior Analyst only once in a lifetime, meaning thereby that for a person to be declared qualified to hold the post of Food Analyst, it is necessary that he should have qualified in the theory examination conducted by the FSSAI for Junior Analyst and it is a one time opportunity. Those who qualify in the said theory examination held for Junior Analyst having three years experience become eligible to be declared qualified as Food Analyst after qualifying in the practical examination conducted by the FSSAI for the said purpose.

36. For appearing in the Junior Analyst examination conducted by the FSSAI, the educational qualifications are the same as those prescribed under Rule 2.1.4 of the

Rules of 2011 pertaining to the academic qualifications for the post of Food Analyst. Thus, under the Rules of 2011 framed by the Central Government, a person possessing the academic qualifications and three years' experience as prescribed in Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 is required to be declared qualified for holding the post of Food Analyst by the Board constituted by the FSSAI and, for that purpose, such person is required to qualify in the examination conducted by the FSSAI for Junior Analyst and for Food Analyst.

37. The State Government, while framing the Rules of 2017 in exercise of the powers conferred under the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India, referred to the posts of Junior Analyst (Food) and Senior Analyst (Food), whereas the post of Food Analyst did not find mention in the Rules of 2017. The post of Junior Analyst (Food) has to be filled by way of direct recruitment, whereas the post of Senior Analyst (Food) is to be filled by promotion from amongst Junior Analyst (Food) having the requisite experience of five years. Such distinction does not find mention either in the Act of 2006 or in the Rules of 2011 framed by the Central Government.

38. The State Authorities, while filing the counter-affidavit, have specifically stated that a Junior Analyst (Food) merely conducts the analysis of food articles submitted for examination, whereas the actual analysis report is prepared and submitted by the Food Analyst in terms of Clause 2 of Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011, which provides that a Food Analyst shall analyse the

articles of food which are sent for analysis. It has further been stated that a person working as Junior Analyst (Food) does not attain the status of Food Analyst unless and until he is declared qualified by the Board of the FSSAI as provided under Rule 2.1.4(1)(ii) of the Rules of 2011. The Junior Analysts (Food) are required to qualify in the Food Analyst examination conducted by the FSSAI and be declared qualified by the Board by granting a certificate declaring them qualified for appointment as Food Analyst. Only upon issuance of such certificate are the Junior Analysts (Food) assigned the additional duties of a Food Analyst.

39. To substantiate the aforesaid stand, Notification dated 31.10.2017 issued from the office of the Food Safety and Drug Administration Department, Lucknow, has been annexed with the counter-affidavit as CA-2, along with the certificate issued by the Food Analyst Examination Board declaring one of the Junior Analyst (Food) qualified for appointment as Food Analyst by the Board of the FSSAI, as required under sub-rule (1)(ii) of Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011.

40. The aforesaid factual position indicates that there is no post of Food Analyst under the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020). Those Junior Analyst (Food) appointed under the Rules of 2017, after having been declared by the Board of the FSSAI to be qualified to hold the post of Food Analyst, are assigned the additional duty of discharging the functions of the post of Food Analyst, as mandated under the Act of 2006 read

with the Rules of 2011 framed under Section 91 of the Act of 2006 by the Central Government.

41. Thus, it is evident from the aforesaid discussion that there is no post of Food Analyst under the service rules framed by the State Government, i.e., the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020). Further, from the aforesaid discussion, it is also clear that the post of Junior Analyst (Food) is neither akin to nor at par with the post of Food Analyst and is a distinct post. It is only when a person holding the post of Junior Analyst (Food) is declared qualified by the FSSAI for appointment as Food Analyst then only such Junior Analyst (Food) is assigned the additional functions of the post of Food Analyst.

42. The mere fact that both appointments are associated with food analysis or function within a food-testing establishment does not render their respective legal fields identical. Identity of the field cannot be inferred merely from a factual or functional overlap, the relevant enquiry is whether the provisions regulate the same legal relationship and impose commands which are incapable of simultaneous obedience. The provisions are required to be construed harmoniously so that full effect is given to both, instead of treating one as impliedly destructive of the other. The Act of 2006 must receive full effect in relation to appointment and functioning of Food Analysts, while the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) must simultaneously receive effect in relation to recruitment, cadre constitution and conditions of service of Junior Analyst (Food).

43. A person may be recruited as Junior Analyst upon satisfying Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) and if the same person is thereafter proposed to exercise the statutory functions of Food Analyst, such person must additionally and independently satisfy Section 45 of the Act of 2006 and Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 and has to be declared as qualified to hold the post of Food Analyst by the Board constituted by FSSAI.

44. The State Service Rules do not authorise any person lacking the Central statutory qualification to act as Food Analyst. The First Amendment Rules, 2020 neither dilute the Central qualification nor prescribe any alternative qualification for appointment under Section 45 of the Act of 2006. It is further submitted that Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) can operate independently even in the absence of Sections 45 and 46 of the Act of 2006, since it governs recruitment to the State cadre of Junior Analyst (Food). Likewise, Sections 45 and 46 of the Act of 2006 and Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 can operate independently without reference to Rule 8(2), since they govern appointment and functioning of Food Analysts which is not a post under the Rules of 2017. Those Junior Analyst (Food) appointed under the Rules of 2017, who are declared by Board constituted by FSSAI as qualified to discharge to functions and duties of Food Analyst, are only assigned to discharge the duties of Food Analyst as required under the Act of 2006.

45. Now coming to the second issue i.e. whether Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) is in derogation of Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 and is, therefore, ultra vires, being hit by Article 254 of the Constitution of India. This Court is of the view that once it has been held that the post of Junior Analyst (Food), for which the selections are being made, is a distinct post from that of Food Analyst referred to in Section 45 of the Act of 2006, the question of repugnancy does not arise.

46. Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) pertains to the qualifications for the post of Junior Analyst (Food), which is a distinct post from that of Food Analyst, as demonstrated hereinabove. Accordingly, the qualifications prescribed under Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) cannot be said to be in conflict with the qualifications prescribed for the post of Food Analyst, as both the posts are distinct.

47. The question then may arise for consideration is whether, notwithstanding the fact that the post of Junior Analyst (Food) is distinct from that of Food Analyst referred to in Section 45 of the Act of 2006, the academic qualifications prescribed for the post of Junior Analyst (Food) ought to be in consonance with the academic qualifications prescribed for the post of Food Analyst, particularly for the reason that ultimately, a person holding the post of Junior Analyst (Food) performs the functions of a Food Analyst after being declared qualified by the Board of the FSSAI, as required under Rule

2.1.4(1)(ii). In such circumstances, excluding the petitioners from the zone of consideration for appointment to the post of Junior Analyst (Food), despite their possessing the academic qualifications prescribed for the post of Food Analyst, may amount to an arbitrary exercise of power by the State Government.

48. The statutory regime as covered by the Act of 2006 as well as the Rules of 2011 framed by the Central Government and the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) framed by the State Government in exercise of powers conferred under Article 309 of the Constitution of India are capable of surviving and operating without the other. Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) neither depends upon nor alters the Central qualification for Food Analyst, while the Central statutory framework neither creates nor regulates the State cadre post of Junior Analyst (Food). There is, thus, no direct conflict, mutual destructiveness or impossibility of harmonious operation. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***West U.P. Sugar Mills Association and Others v. State of Uttar Pradesh and Others, (2020) 9 SCC 548***, has held that the Central enactment operates with primacy only where an actual repugnancy is established and not merely because the State possesses or exercises a power in an allied field. The relevant findings recorded in paragraphs 27 and 28 are extracted below :-

"....27. Clause (1) of Article 254 of the Constitution gives primacy to Central legislations in case of conflict with State laws whether enacted before or after.

The Central law operates only in case of repugnancy and not in a case of mere possibility when such an order might be issued under State law..."

"28. ...It cannot be said that the Central legislation occupies the field... The State Government is not denuded of the power... But State Advised Price has to be higher than the minimum price fixed by the Central Government. But the exercise of the power... cannot be said to be irreconcilable with the minimum price fixation..."

49. The State provision is not repugnant merely because the Central and State authorities regulate allied aspects of the same broader subject. Where the Central standard continues to be observed and the State provision operates additionally, both are legally capable of coexistence, and the State provision is not rendered void under Article 254 of the Constitution of India. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Md. Firoz Mansuri and Others v. State of Bihar and Others, 2026 INSC 68***, while considering the plea of repugnancy, held that a conflict arises only when obedience to one law necessarily results in disobedience of the other or when both laws occupy the same field and are irreconcilable. The findings recorded in paragraph 49 are extracted below:-

".....49. Repugnancy arises only where compliance with one law necessarily results in disobedience of another, or where both laws occupy the same field and are irreconcilable. The Cadre Rules operate in the domain of public employment, while the Act and Regulations operate in the field of

professional regulation. It is true that the Rules framed under Article 309 of the Constitution cannot permit the appointment of persons who are not registered pharmacists under the 2015 Regulations, as Section 42 of the Act expressly prohibits such appointments. However, Section 42 cannot be construed to confer a right to public employment merely by virtue of registration. The Act only creates a pool of eligible persons who may be appointed as pharmacists, the 2015 Regulations certify who is technically competent to practice as a pharmacist, while the Cadre Rules reflect the State's policy choice in selecting from the broader pool for public employment. No conflict arises unless the State appoints someone lacking the minimum technical qualification....."

50. The Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in **B. Sudharma (supra)**, after considering the Central statutory framework and the post created by the State Government within the Food Safety Commissionerate, held that the State appointment could not be regarded as having been made by overlooking the Food Safety and Standards Act, 2006 or the Food Safety and Standards Rules, 2011. The relevant finding recorded in paragraph 76 is extracted below :-

"76. ...taking into account the facts, circumstances and law discussed above, we are of the clear opinion that it can never be said that the 6th respondent was appointed to the present post overlooking the provisions of the Act,

2006 or the Rules, 2011 or any other executive orders."

51. The State, being the employer, is required to determine the relevancy and suitability of qualifications having regard to the nature of the post, duties attached thereto, aptitudes required for efficient discharge of such duties, functionality of the qualification, course content, laboratory exposure, practical training and administrative exigencies. The qualifications enumerated under amended Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) bear an evident nexus with the functions of a scientific food laboratory. The petitioners do not contend that Chemistry, Biochemistry, Microbiology, Dairy Chemistry, Food Technology, Food and Nutrition or Veterinary Science have no relation with the post of Junior Analyst (Food). The grievance of the petitioners is that B.Tech in Food Technology, Dairy Technology, Oil Technology, Biotechnology and allied disciplines ought also to have been included. The said issue concerns the expediency, advisability and utility of adding further technical qualifications to the Service Rule. The scope of judicial review under Article 226 of the Constitution of India does not extend to substituting the Court's assessment of academic suitability for that of the State as recruiting authority. The Court may examine legislative competence, manifest arbitrariness, violation of fundamental rights or total absence of nexus, but cannot formulate a different recruitment policy or prescribe an additional qualification.

52. The relief sought by the petitioners would require this Hon'ble Court to add B.Tech in Food

Technology, Dairy Technology, Oil Technology, Biotechnology and allied disciplines to amended Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 or to declare the said qualifications equivalent to the prescribed qualification. Such an exercise would amount to rewriting the statutory Service Rule and substituting the Court's assessment of suitability and equivalence for that of the State as employer and recruiting authority. Once post of Junior Analyst (Food) is found to be a distinct State cadre post, the suitability of the qualifications prescribed for recruitment thereto falls primarily within the domain of the State Government as the employer and rule-making authority.

53. Every recruitment qualification must be fair, non-arbitrary and reasonably connected with the duties and requirements of the concerned post. Amended Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 fully satisfies the aforesaid constitutional standard. The classification is founded upon possession of qualifications identified by the rule-making authority as suitable for the scientific and laboratory functions of Junior Analyst (Food). The said prescription applies uniformly to every candidate and does not proceed upon any personal, status-based or constitutionally prohibited characteristic. Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India do not require the State to include every academic qualification which may have some broad or remote connection with the subject matter of the post. The constitutional requirement is of a rational nexus and not exhaustive inclusion of all potentially relevant degrees.

54. Even otherwise academic qualifications as laid down under the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) by the State Government, we find that the qualifications prescribed therein for Junior Analyst (Food) are not in derogation of the qualifications laid down in Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 framed by the Central Government for a person to be qualified to hold the post of Food Analyst. The language used in Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 is clear, inasmuch as it provides that a person shall not be qualified for appointment as Food Analyst under the Act unless he holds the academic qualifications as mentioned therein, meaning thereby that a person should possess such minimum academic qualifications as referred to in Rule 2.1.4. This provision in Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 provides for minimum qualifications, which include an academic qualification of a Master's Degree in Chemistry or Biochemistry or Microbiology or Dairy Chemistry or Food Technology, Food and Nutrition or a Degree in Veterinary Sciences, or one who holds a Bachelor's Degree in Dairy Technology or Oil Technology, or one who holds a Degree in Fisheries Science from a University established in India by law, or is an Associate of the Institution of Chemists (India) by examination in the Section of Food Analysts conducted by the Institution of Chemists (India), or any other equivalent qualification recognised by the Central Government for such purposes. A person having any of the minimum alternative qualifications referred to in Rule 2.1.4 has to be held qualified for discharging the duties and functions of Food Analyst subject of him/her declared

qualified for the post of Food Analyst by the Board of FSSAI.

55. The State Government, while framing the Rules under the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India, has prescribed academic qualifications for the post of Junior Analyst (Food) as Master's Degree in the streams which are the same as those as prescribed in Rule 2.1.4. and is one of the minimum academic qualification prescribed in Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011. Thus, the State Government, while prescribing the academic qualifications, has adopted the academic qualifications relating to a Master's Degree as referred to in Rule 2.1.4, while leaving out the other alternative qualifications referred to in Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011. Thus, it cannot be said that the academic qualifications prescribed in the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) for the post of Junior Analyst (Food) are in contravention of Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011, as they adopt the qualifications relating to a Master's Degree referred to in Rule 2.1.4.

56. Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 prescribes the alternate qualifications for the post of Food Analyst and the State Government, having adopted the academic qualifications relating to a Master's Degree referred to in Rule 2.1.4 for the post of Junior Analyst (Food) has, in fact, incorporated the academic qualifications mentioned in Rule 2.1.4. The language of Rule 2.1.4 of Rules of 2011, which refers to the alternate qualifications that one has to possess for holding the post of Food Analyst, gives leeway to the State Government to frame its Rules by

adopting any of the alternative qualifications referred to in Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011, and, as such, it cannot be said that the State Government, while framing the Rules of 2017 and amending them by the First Amendment Rules, 2020, has in any manner violated the mandate of Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011.

57. We also take into notice the fact that Entry 18 of the Concurrent List contains the subject of adulteration of foodstuffs. The Central Government has enacted the Act of 2006, which falls under the Concurrent List (Entry 18). The Rules of 2017 framed by the State Government in exercise of the powers under the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India are in reference to the State Public Services and find place at Entry 41 of the State List. It is the exclusive domain of the State Government, with respect to the subject matters enlisted in the State List, to legislate on the matters contained therein, and, as such, the State Government has framed the Rules of 2017, for which the State Government is competent and has jurisdiction. Article 246(3) of the Constitution of India empowers the Legislature of the State to make laws with respect to any of the matters enumerated in List II of the Seventh Schedule. However, the Rules of 2017 framed by the State Government should not be in derogation of any law made by Parliament on the subject matter. While examining the challenge to Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017, as amended by the First Amendment Rules of 2020, we find that there is no violation by the State Government in framing the Rules of 2017 while fixing the academic qualifications for the post of Junior Analyst

(Food), which is a distinct and different post than that of Food Analyst referred in Section 45 of the Act of 2006 and the academic qualifications are also one of alternate academic qualification which find mention in Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011.

58. In view of the aforesaid discussions, we are of the view that Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) is not in conflict with Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 framed by the Central Government, inasmuch as the academic qualifications for the post in question under the Rules of 2017 are not in derogation of the academic qualifications referred to in Rule 2.1.4. and the post-in-question is also distinct and different than that of Food Analyst as referred in Section 45 of the Act of 2006. Non-inclusion of the alternative academic qualifications mentioned in Rule 2.1.4 in Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 cannot be construed to mean that Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020), is in derogation of Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 framed by the Central Government, as the specific language of Rule 2.1.4 refers to the minimum qualifications for the post in question and the State Government, while framing the Rules of 2017, has adopted one of the alternate minimum qualifications referred to in Rule 2.1.4, which is sufficient compliance with the mandate of Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011.

59. It is to be noted that Parliament has exclusive power to make laws with respect to any of the matters enumerated in List I, whereas the State Legislature has power to make laws with respect to the matters

enumerated in List III of the Seventh Schedule to the Constitution, subject to the provisions of Article 246. The law made by Parliament in respect of matters enumerated in the Concurrent List shall prevail over the State law made by the State Legislature, subject to the exceptions provided under the Constitution. It is settled law that when Parliament and the State Legislature derive power under Article 246(2) of the Constitution from an entry in the Concurrent List, whether prior or subsequent to the law made by the State Legislature, Article 246(2) of the Constitution confers power to legislate upon any subject enumerated in the Concurrent List. The law made by Parliament gets paramountcy over the law made by the State Legislature unless the State law is reserved for consideration of the President and receives his assent. It has to be examined whether there is any repugnancy or conflict between the Central and State laws occupying the same field and whether they can operate harmoniously or not. Article 254 lays emphasis on the words "with respect to that matter". Repugnancy arises when both the laws are fully inconsistent or are absolutely irreconcilable and when it is impossible to obey one without disobeying the other. Repugnancy would arise when conflicting results are produced when both the statutes covering the same field are applied to a given set of facts. However, the Court has to make every attempt to reconcile the provisions of the apparently conflicting laws and the Court would endeavour to give them a harmonious construction.

60. In light of the aforesaid, if we analyse the provisions of Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020), along with Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011, framed by the State Government and the Central Government respectively, we find that the State Government, while framing the Rules, has incorporated one of the alternative minimum qualifications referred to in Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 with regard to the post of Junior Analyst (Food) which is a distinct and different post than that of Food Analyst as referred in Section 45 of the Act of 2006 and, as such, the question of repugnancy does not arise. The Rules of 2011, made by the Central Government under Section 91 of the Act of 2006 and the statutory Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) made by the State Government under the proviso to Article 309 of the Constitution of India, are to be construed harmoniously. There is no incompatibility or inconsistency in the operation of both the Rules for appointing suitable persons to the posts in question vis-à-vis the qualifications prescribed under Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011. A person having the qualifications as referred to in Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) also possesses one of the alternative minimum qualifications referred to in Rule 2.1.4 of the Rules of 2011 and is a fit person to be appointed to the post in question, having fulfilled the qualifications required under the Rules framed by the State Government as well as those framed by the Central Government. The question of repugnancy do not arise as the posts are distinct.

61. In regard to third issue regarding objection raised by the respondents to the challenge by the petitioners to the selections on the ground that, after having participated in the selection process, the petitioners cannot turn around and challenge the selection process, we are of the view that the challenge in the present writ petition is to the eligibility and qualifications for the post in question. Hence, the objection so raised by the respondents cannot be sustained, for the reason that the participation of the petitioners in the selection process was without any meaning, as they did not possess the qualifications required for the post in question itself and their participation in the selection process, therefore, has no bearing. The objection to such extent thus, stands rejected.

62. In view of the aforesaid discussion and the findings recorded hereinabove, this Court is of the view that the post of post of Junior Analyst (Food), for which selections are being made by the State Government vide Advertisement No.4 of 2024 dated 31.10.2024, is distinct from the post of Food Analyst referred to in Section 45 of the Act of 2006. This Court is also of the view that the academic qualifications prescribed under Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) for the post of Junior Analyst (Food) do not violate the academic qualifications prescribed under Rule 2.1.4(1)(i) of the Rules of 2011 framed by the Central Government, as the latter provision relates to the post of Food Analyst. While prescribing the qualifications for the post of Junior

Analyst (Food), the State Government has taken due care to ensure that the qualifications prescribed for the post of Junior Analyst (Food) are in conformity with those prescribed for the post of Food Analyst, inasmuch as one of the alternative qualifications prescribed under Rule 2.1.4(1) of the Rules of 2011 has been prescribed as an academic qualification for the post of Junior Analyst (Food) as the State Government has taken into account the fact that persons appointed to the post of Junior Analyst (Food) are also assigned the additional duties of a Food Analyst upon being declared qualified by the Board of the FSSAI to hold the post of Food Analyst. Thus, Rule 8(2) of the Rules of 2017 (as amended by the Rules of 2020) is held to be intra vires.

63. Accordingly, the writ petition is **dismissed**. No order as to costs.

(Amitabh Kumar Rai,J.) (Alok Mathur,J.)

October 12, 2026

Ashish Dewal