



2026:AHC:9452

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 4857 of 2025

Rajesh Chaudhary

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 5 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Moeez Uddin
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, inter alia, with the following prayer:-

"(I). to issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent no. 2 to decide the case no. 201354054752010214 (State Vs. Ramdev and others), under Section 9 Ka(2), Consolidation of Holdings Act pending before the Consolidation Officer, Brijmanganj, District-Maharajganj.

II. To issue such other and further appropriate writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper under the facts and circumstances of the case."

3. It is submitted that the objection under Section 9A(2) of the U.P.C.H. Act filed on behalf of the petitioner is pending consideration since 2017, despite the fact that the opposite parties in the aforesaid proceedings have already appeared and case is ready for final adjudication.

4. Learned Standing Counsel has no objection in case a direction is issued for early disposal of the aforementioned matter.

5. 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, Brijmanganj, District-Maharajganj (respondent No. 2), before whom the aforementioned case is pending disposal, to decide the same expeditiously, preferably, within a period of **six months** from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

6. 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.

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

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)

January 14, 2026
Neetu