



2026:AHC-LKO:40147

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

MATTERS UNDER ARTICLE 227 No. - 3339 of 2026

Ram Baran @ Ram Baran Pal

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Addl. Commissioner (Judicial), Ayodhya
Division, Ayodhya And 10 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Achal Singh Yadav
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Mohan Singh

Court No. - 4

HON'BLE SYED QAMAR HASAN RIZVI, J.

1. Heard Sri Achal Singh Yadav, learned counsel for the petitioner; Sri Govind Kumar Chaurasia, Advocate, holding brief of Mohan Singh, learned counsel for the Gaon Sabha, and Sri Devesh Chandra Pathak, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel, for the State/opposite party and perused the record.

2. The instant writ petition has been filed, *inter alia*, for the following relief:

"... to issue a direction to the opposite party No. 1/Additional Commisioner (Judicial), Ayodhya Division, Ayodhya to decide the Appeal No. 1061/2025 (Computerized No. C20250400001061), Rambaran v. Sunita Yadav, & ors., pending since 02.05.2025 within a stipulated time as prescribed by the Hon'ble Court."

3. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that appeal under Section 331(3) of the U.P. Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act 1950 is pending for disposal since May, 2025 before the opposite party No. 1/Additional Commisioner (Judicial), Ayodhya Division, Ayodhya. He submits that the petitioner is suffering hardship because of the pendency of the aforesaid appeal.

4. Para 458(2) of U.P. Revenue Court Manual provides as under:

"458(2). the appellate or the revisional court shall make all endeavour to finally decide the appeal or revision, as the case may be, within a period of six months from the date of filing the appeal or revision and if the appeal or revision is not decided within the aforesaid period, the reason for the same shall be recorded. "

5. There is a clear legislative mandate that if proceedings are not concluded within the period of time as provided under the aforesaid provision, reasons for the same shall be recorded.

6. Learned Standing Counsel submits that he has no objection to the extent that a direction is issued by this Court for expeditious disposal of the above mentioned case, within stipulated period as fixed by this Court.

7. In view of the nature of the order proposed to be passed, the service of notice upon the opposite parties No.3 to 10 is dispensed with.

8. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose would be served in keeping this writ petition pending.

9. Accordingly, without advertng on merits of the case, this Court deems it appropriate to finally dispose of the present writ petition, with a direction to the Additional Commisioner (Judicial), Ayodhya Division, Ayodhya (opposite party No. 1, before whom the Appeal No. 1061/2025 (Computerized No. C20250400001061), Rambaran v. Sunita Yadav, & ors., is pending for disposal, to decide the same strictly in accordance with law, by a reasoned and speaking order on merit, after affording opportunity of hearing to the parties concerned, expeditiously and preferably within a period of **six months**

from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order, unless there is any legal impediment. It is further directed that no unnecessary adjournments be granted to either of the parties, if prayed for, will be permissible to be granted only in exceptional circumstances.

10. With the aforesaid direction, the present writ petition is **disposed of**.

June 3, 2026

A.Nigam

(Syed Qamar Hasan Rizvi,J.)