



2026:AHC-LKO:5147-DB

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - C No. - 593 of 2026

Matsya Jivi Sahakari Samiti Ltd. Thru. Secretary
Ram Ratan

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

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

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Narvind Kumar Singh, Deepak Yadav
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C., Dilip Kumar Pandey

Court No. - 1

HON'BLE RAJAN ROY, J.

HON'BLE ABDHESH KUMAR CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Heard Shri Narvind Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner and Shri Manish Mishra, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State.
2. The petitioner herein has challenged a notice for recovery issued to him for realization of dues of annual lease rent in respect of fisheries rights settled with him in respect of pond existing on Gata No. 1343 situated at Village Nauner, Pargana- Hargaon, Tehsil and District- Sitapur.
3. The contention is that though, he was the highest bidder in the auction and in pursuance to the acceptance of his bid he has even deposited the annual rent for one year but neither the lease deed was executed in his favour nor possession of pond was granted to him, therefore, he never exercised his fisheries rights in respect thereof, as such, demand of amount mentioned in the notice for recovery is illegal and unjustified. He has already represented to the District Magistrate, Sitapur on 28.11.2025.
4. Looking into the facts of the case, let the District Magistrate, Sitapur get the matter inquired as to whether consequent to acceptance of bid of the petitioner, if it is so, possession of pond was handed over to him or not. If not, then, how lease rent is being demanded from the petitioner and then, take suitable decision in the matter as to the liability of the petitioner under the impugned notice for recovery issued by the Tehsildar, Sadar,

Sitapur.

5. Let the aforesaid exercise be completed within a period of six weeks from the date a certified copy of this order is submitted.

6. Till then, i.e., till decision is taken by the District Magistrate/Collector, Sitapur aforesaid, recovery under the impugned notice shall not be given effect.

7. This order is being passed to facilitate a decision by the District Magistrate/Collector, Sitapur and to meet the ends of substantial justice, especially as, no instruction has been provided by the official opposite parties to the learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State on the aforesaid issue.

8. With the aforesaid observations/directions, the writ petition is **disposed of.**

(Abdhesh Kumar Chaudhary,J.) (Rajan Roy,J.)

January 22, 2026
R.K.P.