



2026:AHC-LKO:12769-DB

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - C No. - 1413 of 2026

M/S Anant Ram Verma Eint Udyog Lakhimpur
Kheri Thru Proprietor Anant Ram Verma And Anr.

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

U.P. Pollution Control Board Lucknow Thru
Member Secy. And Ors.

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Anurag Narian Srivastava, Pawan Kumar Verma, Vartika Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: Ashok Kumar Verma, Shailendra Singh Rajawat

Court No. - 1

**HON'BLE RAJAN ROY, J.
HON'BLE MANISH KUMAR, J.**

1. Supplementary affidavit filed today is taken on record.
2. Heard.
3. Petitioners stake their rights to run a brick-kiln on the land in question, however, learned counsel for the Pollution Control Board says that the land on which brick-kiln was situated belongs to opposite party no.3 who happens to be son of petitioner no.2. The consent to operate granted to the petitioners expired in 2023, no application for its renewal was given by the petitioners. Opposite party nos.3 and 4 made an application for grant of consent to operate in respect to the same land which was recorded in the name of opposite party no.3 which was granted in March, 2025 and ever since then opposite party no.3/4 is operating the brick-kiln. The land does not belong to the petitioners and they have never applied for renewal/ grant of consent to operate, therefore, they have no cause to agitate before this Court. Learned counsel for the petitioners on the other hand states that a suit for injunction was filed by the petitioners against the private opposite parties wherein initially no injunction was granted by the trial court but in appeal the same was granted by the High Court on 11.11.2025 in First Appeal From Order No.475 of 2025 [Anant Ram Verma vs. Lalit Kumar Verma & Ors.] which is operating, therefore,

challenge to the consent order dated 19.03.2025 granted to opposite party nos.3 and 4. However, learned counsel for the Pollution Control Board says that the interim order granted by the High Court in the aforesaid appeal is only to the effect that status quo be maintained in respect to the suit property and status quo as on 11.11.2025 was that opposite party nos. 3 and 4 were running the brick-kiln on the land in question in pursuance to the consent order granted prior to 11.11.2025. However, at this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners says that while granting the consent to operate, there is a reference to the old firm that of the petitioners which should not have been made as it is a proprietorship firm in which opposite party no.3 does not have any stakes. It is informed that opposite party no.4 is a partnership firms of which other private opposite parties are partners.

4. Leaving it open for the petitioners to seek appropriate remedy with regard to his rights in the suit property, in the pending appeal bearing First Appeal From Order No.475 of 2025 and/ or to move an application before the opposite party no.2, if there is a cause, which shall obviously be considered as per law and in that process opposite party nos.3 and 4 be also be heard, we **dispose of** this petition as essentially there is a dispute between petitioner no.2 and his son i.e. opposite party no.3 as noticed hereinabove and especially as the lease granted by the opposite party no.3 in favour of petitioner no.2 has already expired.

(Manish Kumar,J.) (Rajan Roy,J.)

February 18, 2026

Shanu/-