

From,

Ashish Kumar Churasia  
Addle. Principal Judge Family Court No-10  
Lucknow

To,

The Registrar General,  
Hon'ble High Court of Judicature Allahabad

Through,

The Principal  
Judge Family Court, Lucknow

Sub:- Representation against Annual Character Role, recorded by  
district & sessions Judge, Kanpur Nagar for the year 2022-23

Respected Sir,

With profound respect to Hon'ble Court my representation with  
regard to subject, mentioned above is a below:-

1. Shri Sandeep Jain, the then District and session Judge, Kanpur Nagar in his remarks given in above ACR 2022-23 has written nothing adverse against my work conduct and integrity. My control over the files disposal of execution cases Judgments being sound well resend and expressed in good Language control over office and administrative capacity, relation with member of Bar and brother officers, inspection and its effect, punctuality and amenability to senior officers behavior towards woman and overall assessment has been rated as '**Good**'.
2. The adverse remark against which this representation is with regard to **column No-4** "other remarks if any" Written as below"-

"As per action plan officer was expected to decide 25 oldest sessions Trial 10 oldest Criminal Appel , 10 oldest civil appel 10 oldest execution cases' but the officer has decided 12/25 oldest session Trial. 4/10 oldest Criminal Appel, 3/10 oldest Civil Appel. 10/10 oldest execution cases.

As per the Action Plan, the officer has decided less number of session Trial and Civil Appel and desired number of Criminal Appel and execution case. The

officer is experienced have service of about 16 years and with more effort, could have decided more cases".

Meaning thereby, less disposal with regard to Civil Appel has been mentioned, which is **factually wrong**. The officer has decided 3 oldest Civil Appel out of excepted 10 but it has been written to be 4/10 against the statement submitted by the officer.

With regard to session Trial, the statement annexed by officer in **column no-3** scheduled Performa, it was specifically written by me that **49 old cases more than 05 years old and 52 old cases more than 10 years old have been decided**, whereas as per unit system, 03 old cases are to be decided in one quarter, i.e. total 101 old cases are to be decided in one year. This was the target in **column no-3** of the Performa and in achievement of same, it was specifically written by me that **no shortfall in units are there rather achievement was 148.95% as against 100% and in disposal of old cases including more that 05 years and 10 years 101 old cases were decided by me**. Hence, there was no shortfall but respected District Judge probably over looked my above statement of column 03 it was my misfortune.

3. In my Court a retired person deputed as steno so that disposal of action plan files.

The undersigned decided the most oldest sessions trial of this judgship of the year 1980 state V/s Ashok Mishra under section 302 I.P.C. this important point has been ignored by the learned District Judge while considering the ACR.


Where in the entry number 01 (F) which is regarding whether the judgments on facts and law are on the whole sound well reasoned and expressed in good language the learned District Judge has remarked "yas". These entries are self contradictory. Besides this the undersigned has never received any do letter regarding any lacks any of these aspects Judgment nor it has been mentioned in this column that in which Judgement there is deficiency of above aspects mentioned in column 01 (f)

Whereas on the occasion of Hindi Diwas celebration in Kanpur Judgeship a Judgment writing competition was organized in which the undersigned secured second Position in the entire Judgeship and was accolade for the same by the Learned District Judge himself in presence of whole Judgeship.

4. Due to the confrontation and escalation of friction between the then Learned District Judge of Kanpur Nagar Shri Sandeep Jain and the Bar the lawyers were on strike for a long time of all officer due to which the Judicial work of the court was substantially affected. This fact has also been not considered while giving remarks on the ACR.
5. I being officer of 16 years standing have been assigned a late of administrative works **with additional Incharge Nazarat** given in statements, even the with my sincere and devoted effort , I did achive **148.95%** out turn which was much more than target.
6. Hon'ble Court is being prayed for doing justice with me by defeating above adverse remark and rating me with a degree upper than **good officer**.
7. Your honour is being requested to place my representation before Hon'ble Court for kind and sympathetic consideration prayed as above.

Dated-01-06-2023

Sincerely Yours

  
01/06/23

**Ashish Kumar Churasia**  
Addle. Principal Judge  
Family Court No-10  
Lucknow  
ID No-UP6360