



2026:AHC:8424

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 43 of 2026

Avinash And 2 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Anand Kumar Chaurasia, Shashi Bhushan Mishra
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Ramesh Chandra Dwivedi

Court No. - 54

HON'BLE DINESH PATHAK, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned Standing Counsel and perused the record.
2. The petitioners have invoked the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India assailing the order dated 08.10.2025 and 13.10.2025 passed by the Settlement Officer of Consolidation in Appeal No. 495/2007-2008.
3. Learned counsel for the private respondent No. 5 has raised preliminary objection with regard to maintainability of the instant writ petition on account of pendency of the revision against the order dated 08.10.2025 passed by the Settlement Officer of Consolidation.
4. Perusal of the record evinces that the Settlement Officer of Consolidation, vide order dated 08.10.2025, has condoned the delay on the cost of Rs. 5,000/- in filing the appeal and fixed the date for hearing. Subsequently, by order dated 13.10.2025, he has granted interim order in favour of the appellant. When confronted, the learned counsel for the petitioners has admitted the pendency of the revision against the delay condonation order dated 08.10.2025, whereby the appeal has been treated to be filed within the prescribed period of limitation. Therefore, in my considered opinion, while the matter is seized with the Deputy Director of Consolidation to examine the legality and validity of the order dated 08.10.2025 passed by the Settlement Officer of Consolidation, there is no justification to entertain the instant writ petition against the said order dated 08.10.2025.

5. In this conspectus, as above, instant writ petition is **dismissed** on the ground of maintainability.

6. Before parting with the matter, learned counsel for the petitioners has urged for expeditious disposal of the revision pending before the Deputy Director of Consolidation against the order dated 08.10.2025.

7. Learned Standing Counsel as well as learned counsel for the private-respondent No. 5 has no objection in issuing a direction for expeditious disposal of the revision.

8. Thus, the Deputy Director of Consolidation, before whom the revision is pending consideration against the order dated 08.10.2025, is directed to make an endeavour to decide the same expeditiously preferably at the earliest.

January 13, 2026

vinay

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)