



2026:AHC:5211

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 5197 of 2025

Sant Kumar And 2 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 5 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Ramakant Tiwari
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Akshay Raghuvanshi, Ritesh Kumar Singh, Achal Singh, C.S.C.

Court No. - 54

HON'BLE DINESH PATHAK, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitionerS, learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondent nos. 1 and 2, learned counsel for the Gaon Sabha and learned counsel for private respondent no. 4.

2. In view of the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case and order proposed to be passed herein under, the instant writ petition is being decided finally with the consent of the learned counsel for the parties present, without calling for their respective affidavits and without putting notice to the proforma respondent nos. 5 and 6.

3. The petitioners have invoked the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, assailing the order dated 03.11.2025 passed by the Deputy Director of Consolidation, Chitrakoot, on the ground that revision was decided exparte, without affording an effective opportunity of hearing to the present petitioners.

4. Perusal of the order under challenged dated 03.11.2025 passed by the Deputy Director of Consolidation (respondent no.2) reveals that the same was passed behind the back of the present petitioners, without affording them an opportunity of hearing. The revisional Court has merely observed that the opposite parties in the revision (petitioners herein) were not taking interest in disposal of the revision. The absence of an opportunity of hearing to the present petitioner is admitted by the learned counsel for contesting respondent no. 4 as well as the learned counsel for the Gaon Sabha and learned Standing Counsel for the State. They have no objection, if the present matter is remitted to the Deputy Director of Consolidation to decide

the same afresh, after giving proper opportunity of hearing to the petitioners.

5. In this conspectus, above no useful purpose would be served to keep the instant writ petition pending. As such, the instant writ petition succeeds and is allowed. The order dated 03.11.2024 passed by the Deputy Director of Consolidation is hereby quashed and both the parties are relegated before the revisional Court.

6. It is excepted that learned Deputy Director of Consolidation shall make an endeavour to decide the revision, by a reasoned and speaking order, after giving opportunity of hearing to the parties concerned, in accordance with law, expeditiously, preferably within a period of **two months** from the date of production of a certified copy of this order

7. Both the parties are directed to appear before the Deputy Director of Consolidation, Chitrakoot (respondent no. 2) on **28.01.2026**.

January 8, 2026
Neetu

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)