



2026:AHC-LKO:4690-DB

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - C No. - 535 of 2026

Munni Devi

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Its Prin. Secy. Housing And
Urban Planning Deptt. Lko. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Anand Singh Pawar, Nishtha Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Ratnesh Chandra

Court No. - 1

HON'BLE RAJAN ROY, J.

HON'BLE ABDHESH KUMAR CHAUDHARY, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel for State respondent nos.1 and 2 and Shri Ratnesh Chandra, learned counsel for Lucknow Development Authority-respondent nos.3 and 4.

2. As of now the demolition order dated 25.10.2024 does not mention the name of the house or portion of the house claimed by the petitioner as her, bearing no. 503/134 (208A). *Prima facie* such bifurcation or allotment of separate numbers in respect of same premises takes place only when the ownership changes unless the counsel for Lucknow Development Authority is able to satisfy the Court otherwise, therefore, as the petitioner was not given any notice in the demolition proceedings, the demolition of her house or the premises claimed by her cannot take place in pursuance to the order dated 25.10.2024.

3. At this stage Shri Ratnesh Chandra, learned counsel for Lucknow Development Authority states that the prescribed

authority under the Uttar Pradesh Urban Buildings (Regulation of Letting, Rent and Eviction) Act, 1972 may be given liberty to proceed afresh against the petitioner under Section 27 of the Uttar Pradesh Urban Buildings (Regulation of Letting, Rent and Eviction) Act, 1972 and the petition be disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

4. In view of the above statement made by Shri Ratnesh Chandra, we dispose of this petition with the observations that if there is a cause against the petitioner for proceeding under Section 27 of the Uttar Pradesh Urban Buildings (Regulation of Letting, Rent and Eviction) Act, 1972, then it shall be open for the prescribed authority to so proceed but without relying upon the order dated 25.10.2024. We further make it clear that before proceeding, the prescribed authority should be satisfied that there is a cause on facts and in law for proceeding against the petitioner. This order will have no bearing on the implementation of the order dated 25.10.2024 *qua* the person who was heard in those proceedings. In view of this order the Lucknow Development Authority shall not demolish the existing premise unless an order is passed under Section 27 of the Uttar Pradesh Urban Buildings (Regulation of Letting, Rent and Eviction) Act, 1972, as per law.

5. The writ petition is, accordingly, **disposed of**.

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

January 21, 2026

Arnima