



2026:AHC-LKO:5045

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 2 of 2026

Archana Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Secy. Revenue Deptt. Lko. And
5 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Gyanendra Mishra
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Mohan Singh

Court No. - 25

HON'BLE AMITABH KUMAR RAI, J.

1. Sri Vinod Singh, Advocate holding brief of Sri Gyanendra Mishra, learned counsel for the petitioner has put in appearance and has requested for adjournment of the case on the ground that learned counsel for the petitioner is out of station. The instant case was called up for hearing on 19.01.2026 and on that day no one appeared and the case was passed over for the day. Today also request is made for adjournment of the case.

2. On the other hand Sri Shailendra Kumar Singh, learned Chief Standing Counsel assisted by Sri Yogesh Kumar Awasthi, Standing Counsel has vehemently opposed the maintainability of the present writ petition on the ground that the petition in the form of P.I.L. has been filed without following the provisions of Chapter 22 Rule 1(3-A) of the Allahabad High Court Rules, 1952.

3. It has been contended that in paragraph 4 of petition, it has been stated that the petitioner has no personal interest in the instant P.I.L. however there is not disclosure about the credentials as required under the Rules of the High Court referred hereinabove.

4. Sri Shailendra Kumar Singh further informs that in fact prior to filing of the instant P.I.L. an FIR was lodged by respondent no. 6 against whom relief has been claimed in the present writ petition against the petitioner, his husband and one another close associate of the petitioner under Section 356(4) and 351(2) of BNS 2023. It has been contended that the

instant PIL has been filed as counter blast to the FIR lodged by the respondent no. 6 against the petitioner and her brother. It has also been submitted by the CSC that the averment in paragraph 4 of the writ petition that the petitioner has no personal interest is also false, in view of the fact that the FIR was lodged by respondent no. 6 against the petitioner and his husband and as such it cannot be said that the instant PIL is not by way of personal interest.

5. Learned CSC has relied on the judgement of Division Bench of this Court in the case of Gurmet Singh Soni Vs. State of U.P. and Ors. decided on 07.06.2021 in PIL Civil No. 11520 of 2021 from paragraph 22 onwards in support of his objection regarding no disclosure of credential by the petitioner in the PIL. From bare perusal of the averment made in the paragraph 4 of the writ petition, it transpires that it do not disclose that it fulfills requirement of making declaration as provided under Rule 1(3-A) of Chapter XXII of the Allahabad High Court Rules, 1952. The provision for incorporation of the Rules 1(3-A) is in furtherance of the direction of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of State of Uttranchal Vs. Balwant Singh Chaufal and Ors, (2010) 3 SCC 402.

6. This Court is of the view that since the instant petition do not conform to requirement of Rule 1(3-A) of Chapter XXII of the High Court Rules, 1952, hence, cannot be entertained and is accordingly **rejected**.

(Amitabh Kumar Rai,J.)

January 21, 2026

Anurag