



2026:AHC:9048

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 4712 of 2025

Teerath

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of Uttar Pradesh And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Mahesh Kumar Sahani, Narendra Singh
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. The petitioner has invoked the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, assailing the order dated 10.3.2025 passed by the Deputy Director of Consolidation (in brevity 'DDC') in Revision No.0261 of 2024, affirming the order dated 06.02.2024 passed by the Settlement Officer of Consolidation (in brevity 'SOC') in Case No. RST-0127-2022, arising out of proceedings under Section 9-B(3) of the U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1953 (in brevity 'UPCH Act').
3. The grievance of the petitioner is that his claim over Plot No.927/2, area 0.025 hectare, has illegally been rejected by the SOC as well as the DDC.
4. Having considered the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Standing Counsel for the State respondents and upon perusal of the record, it is manifest that the Plot No.927/2 is a public utility land and falls under Section 132 of the U.P. Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act, 1950. The appellate court as well as revisional court have rightly rejected the claim of the petitioner over the public utility land i.e. Plot No.927/2. No private person can claim his right, title or interest over public utility land which is protected under Section 132 of the U.P. Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act, 1950. Both the courts below viz. the SOC and the DDC have rightly rejected the claim of the petitioner over Plot No.927/2.
5. In this conspectus, as above, I do not find any justifiable ground to

entertain the instant writ petition and interfere with the orders passed by the courts below. There is no illegality, perversity or infirmity in the order impugned passed by the consolidation courts so as to warrant the indulgence of this court in the exercise of its extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. There is nothing on the record to demonstrate how the present petitioner has been prejudiced, or if there is any likelihood of causing miscarriage of justice to him, owing to the orders under challenge.

6. Resultantly, the instant writ petition, being misconceived and devoid of merits, is **dismissed** with no orders as to the costs.

January 14, 2026

vkg

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)