



2026:AHC:14983

## HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 208 of 2026

Jai Gopal Rajpoot

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 8 Others

.....Respondent(s)

---

|                           |   |                                    |
|---------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Counsel for Petitioner(s) | : | Dev Kumar Kesharwani, Rakesh Singh |
| Counsel for Respondent(s) | : | C.S.C.                             |

---

Court No. - 55

**HON'BLE CHANDRA KUMAR RAI, J.**

1. Heard Sri Rakesh Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Shailesh Srivastava, learned counsel for the state-respondents.

2. The instant writ petition has been filed for the following reliefs:-

"i. To issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding & directing to the respondent no.2 to decide the revision no. 80 of 2002, computer case No. AL2002034099261 (Panna Lal Vs. Chheda Lal), under section 333 of U.P. Zamindari Abolition & Land Reform Act, with in stipulated period, which is still pending before him till today.

ii. to issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding & directing to the respondent no.2 to decide the impleadment application dated 19.07.2007 in revision no. 80 of 2002, computer case No. AL2002034099261 (Panna Lal Vs. Chheda Lal), under section 333 of U.P. Zamindari Abolition & Land Reform Act, which is still pending before him till today."

3. Counsel for the petitioner states that revision filed by the private respondents, arising out of the proceeding of suit under Section 229-B of the U.P. Z.A. & L.R. Act is pending before respondent no. 2/Board of Revenue, U.P. at Prayagraj. He submitted that impleadment application filed on behalf of the petitioner, on the basis of sale deed, in the pending revision, is also pending for consideration before the Board of Revenue since 19.7.2007. He also

submitted that appropriate direction be issued for the expeditious disposal of the pending impleadment application as well as the proceeding of revision.

4. I have considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the records.

5. There is no dispute about the fact that revision filed by the private respondent is pending before respondent no.2/Board of Revenue, U.P. at Prayagra since 2002. There is also no dispute about the fact that impleadment application dated 19.7.2007 filed on behalf of the petitioner in the aforementioned revision is also pending for consideration.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent no.2/Board of Revenue, U.P. at Prayagraj to decide the impleadment application dated 19.7.2007, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 6 weeks, from the date of production of a certified copy of this order before the authority concerned, in accordance with law. It is further directed that the Board of Revenue shall decide the aforementioned revision, expeditiously, preferably within a period of 2 months from the date of passing of the order on the impleadment application, after affording proper opportunity of hearing to the parties concerned, in accordance with law.

**(Chandra Kumar Rai,J.)**

**January 21, 2026**

C.Prakash