



2026:AHC:166352

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 25114 of 2026

Ravindra Kumar

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 5 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Birendra Kumar, Dharmendra Kumar Dohare
Counsel for Respondent(s) : Anurag Upadhyay, C.S.C., Rameshwar Prasad Shukla

Court No. - 37

HON'BLE CHANDRA KUMAR RAI, J.

1. Heard Sri Dharmendra Kumar Dohare, learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri Anurag Upadhyay, learned counsel for respondent no.6, Sri Hari Mohan Srivastava, learned Addl. C.S.C. for the state-respondents and Sri Rameshwar Prasad Shukla, learned counsel for the respondent-gaon sabha.

2. The instant writ petition has been filed for the following relief:-

"(A) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari, quashing the impugned order dated 6.4.2026 (Annexure No.7) passed by the Additional Commissioner (Administrative), Azamgarh Zone, Azamgarh in Appeal No.1954/2024 (Computerized Case No.C202415500001954) (Ravindra vs. Sahadur), under Section 24(4) of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 as well as order dated 24.10.2024 (Annexure No.4) passed by the Sub Divisional Magistrate, Madhuban, Mau in Case No.00851/2020 (Computerized Case No.T20201551030085) (Sahadur vs. Gaon Sabha), under Section 24 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006, Mauza Tajpur, Pargana Nathupur, Tehsil Madhuban, District Mau."

3. Counsel for the petitioner submitted that application under Section 24 of the U.P. Revenue code, 2006, filed by private respondent nos. 5 & 6 has been allowed in illegal and arbitrary

manner, affecting the interest of the petitioner. He submitted that against the order passed by the Sub Divisional Officer in the proceeding under Section 24 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006, restoration application filed by the petitioner is still pending before the Sub Divisional Officer. He submitted that since the pending restoration application was not considered by the Sub Divisional Officer, accordingly, petitioner was advised to file an appeal under Section 24(4) of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 which has been dismissed in illegal and arbitrary manner. He submitted that orders passed by the Sub Divisional Officer and the Additional Commissioner in appeal should be set aside and the application under Section 24 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 filed by the private respondent should be considered afresh.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent no.6 submitted that application under Section 24 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 filed by respondent nos. 5 & 6 has been rightly allowed on the basis of the report submitted in the proceeding. He submitted that petitioner has filed a restoration application which is still pending before the Sub Divisional Officer but in spite of the pendency of the restoration application, the appeal has been filed on behalf of petitioner which has been rightly dismissed. He also submitted that the order passed in appeal under Section 24(4) of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 is revisable under Section 210 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006, as such, the instant writ petition should be dismissed on the ground of alternative remedy.

5. I have considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties and perused the records.

6. There is no dispute about the fact that appeal under Section 24(4) of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006, filed by the petitioner has been dismissed vide order dated 6.4.2026.

7. The appellate order passed under Section 24(4) of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 is revisable under Section 210 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006, as such, the writ petition cannot be

entertained.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the writ petition is dismissed with the liberty to the petitioner to file revision under Section 210 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 in accordance with law before the revisional court.

August 10, 2026

C.Prakash

(Chandra Kumar Rai,J.)