



2026:AH:6248

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 4268 of 2025

Kamla Prashad

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Dr. Ashish Kumar Dubey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 54

HON'BLE DINESH PATHAK, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel, and perused the record.

2. While entertaining the instant writ petition following order dated November 13, 2025 has been passed :

"1. Heard Dr. Ashish Kumar Dubey, learned counsel for petitioner and Sri Anil Kumar Yadav, learned Standing Counsel for the State.

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 directing the respondent no. 2 to conclude and decide the proceedings of Case No. 0234 under Section 12 of the U.P.C.H. Act, (Ram Lakhan Vs. Sitaram) pending in the Court of Consolidation Officer, Badlapur, District-Jaunpur, within stipulated time period as may be fixed by this Hon'ble Court.

ii. To issue any other suitable writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case; and

iii. To award the cost to the Petitioner."

3. Learned counsel for petitioner submitted that proceeding under Section 12 of the U.P.C.H. Act is pending before respondent no. 2-Consolidation Officer, Badlapur, Jaunpur in pursuance of the remand order, passed by Assistant Settlement Officer Consolidation dated 02.07.2004.

4. Sri Anil Kumar Yadav, learned Standing Counsel for the State shall obtain instructions from respondent no. 2 as to why the proceeding is pending for last more than 21 years.

5. Put up this matter as fresh on 28.11.2025."

3. Learned Standing Counsel has filed the copy of instructions today in court, which is taken on record. Office is directed to proceed accordingly.

4. It is submitted, on the basis of the instructions, that the substitution

application dated 16.10.2025 is pending consideration in the original proceedings and after a decision on the substitution application, the original proceedings would be decided finally.

5. Learned Standing Counsel has no objection in issuing a direction for expeditious disposal of the aforesaid proceedings under Section 12 of the U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1953.

6. In this conspectus, as above, no useful purpose would be served to keep this matter pending, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to finally dispose of the present writ petition, without making any observation on the merits of the case as mentioned in the present writ petition, with a direction to Consolidation Officer (respondent No. 2), before whom the aforementioned matter is pending disposal, to decide the same expeditiously, preferably, within a period of five months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

7. It is expected that it should be decided by a reasoned and speaking order, in accordance with law, after affording opportunity of hearing to the parties concerned without granting unnecessary adjournments to either of the parties.

8. With the aforesaid direction, present writ petition is **disposed of**.

January 9, 2026

vkg

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)