



2026:AHC:4728

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 5135 of 2025

Amarraj

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P And 8 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Manoj Kumar Yadav
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. After due deliberations at length, learned counsel has pressed prayer No. 2 of the writ petition, which is produced hereinbelow:-

"ii) to issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding the respondent no. 2 to decide the restoration application (Soni Versus Deep Chand) under Section 12(2) of U.P.C.H. Act before the court below which is pending since 23.11.2022 (Annexure No.9) within some stipulated period."

3. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that against the order dated 07.11.2022 passed by the Settlement Officer of Consolidation, the present petitioner has preferred a restoration application on 23.11.2022 which is pending consideration since the date of its filing despite the fact that opposite party has already appeared and the 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 Deputy Director of Consolidation (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.

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. Before parting with the matter, learned counsel for the petitioner has prayed for an interim relief during the pendency of the restoration application.

8. Needless to say that it is always open to the petitioner to move an appropriate application for interim relief before the court concerned where the restoration application is pending. In case, any such application is filed, the same shall be decided by the court concerned expeditiously in accordance with law.

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

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)

January 8, 2026

vinay