



2026:AHC:14221

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 168 of 2026

Panna Lal

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Ram Sajiwan Prajapati
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Bhupendra Kumar Tripathi, C.S.C.

Court No. - 55

HON'BLE CHANDRA KUMAR RAI, J.

1. Vakalatnama filed by Mr. Kamlesh Kumar Tiwari & Mr. Sanjay Kumar Upadhyay, Advocates on behalf of respondent no.5 is taken on record.

2. Heard Mr. Ram Sajiwan Prajapati, learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Kamlesh Kumar Tiwari & Mr. Sanjay Kumar Upadhyay, learned counsel for respondent no.5, Mr. Ajay Kumar Baranwal, learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondents and Mr. Bhupendra Kumar Tripathi, learned counsel for the respondent- Gaon Sabha.

3. The instant writ petition has been filed for the following relief:

"issue a writ, order in the nature of certiorari quash the impugned order dated 4.12.2025 passed by respondent no.2/ Member (Judicial), Board of Revenue, U.P. at Lucknow in Case No.T.A. / 2004 of 2025, Computerized Case No.R20251436002004 (Panna Lal vs. Shri Ram Achhaivar Chauhan, Additional District Magistrate (Finance & Revenue), Jaunpur, under Section 212 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 whereby rejected the transfer application of the petitioner."

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has applied for transfer under Section 212 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 to transfer the proceeding initiated under

Section 98(1) of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 but transfer application filed by petitioner has been rejected by board of revenue on misconceived ground. He further submitted that in view of the averment made in the transfer application, the pending proceeding under Section 98(1) of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 should be transferred from the court concerned to any other Court.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.5 submitted that the petitioner has no locus to intervene the proceeding under Section 98(1) of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006, as such, he is only interested to linger on the proceeding under Section 98(1) of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 by one way or other. He further submitted that the sale deed was executed in favour of respondent no.5 by the recorded tenure holder- Shyam Lal after getting permission as provided under law, as such, petitioner has no locus to intervene the proceeding under Section 98 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006. He further submitted that transfer application filed by petitioner has been rightly rejected under the impugned order.

6. I have considered the argument advanced by learned counsel for the parties and perused the records.

7. There is no dispute about the fact that the transfer application filed by petitioner has been rejected under the impugned order by the Board of Revenue after calling report from the Additional District Magistrate (Finance & Revenue), Jaunpur before whom the proceedings are pending.

8. It is also material to mention that the Court concerned against whom the allegation has been made by the petitioner has been transferred, as such, the ground raised in the transfer application has come to an end.

9. Considering the averment made in the transfer application as well as the order impugned passed by the Board of Revenue, there is no scope for interference against the impugned order

passed by the Board of Revenue.

10. Considering the entire facts and circumstances, no interference is required in the matter.

11. The writ petition is ***dismissed accordingly.***

(Chandra Kumar Rai,J.)

January 20, 2026

Rameez