



2026:AHC:9887

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 5300 of 2025

Indu Prakash

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

The State Of U.P. And 6 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Ram Janam Shahi
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 54

HON'BLE DINESH PATHAK, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, and learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondents.

2. The petitioner is aggrieved going to pendency of the impleadment application moved on his behalf before the Settlement Officer of Consolidation in Appeal No. 1414 of 2023 (Indu Prakash Vs. Sobhavati).

3. Having consider the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondent and upon perusal of a record, it is manifest that having been aggrieved by the order date 20.12.1997 passed by the Assistant Consolidation Officer in proceeding under Section 12 of the U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act (in brevity U.P.C.H. Act), Indu Prakash (petitioner herein) preferred an appeal dated 17.04.2023. During pendency of appeal, he moved an impleadment application dated 10.03.2025 proposing some of the interested persons to be impleaded in the array of the parties of the appeal.

4. The Settlement Officer of Consolidation has jotted in the margin of the aforesaid impleadment application, vide order dated 02.06.2025, directing that same would be decided at the time of final hearing of the appeal. Being aggrieved petitioner preferred revision. The Deputy Director of Consolidation dismissed the revision on the ground of maintainability, holding that the order passed by the Settlement Officer of Consolidation is interlocutory in nature.

5. I am in agreement with the submission advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner that deferring the disposal of the impleadment application until the time of final hearing of the appeal would further protract the litigation, inasmuch as, if the application is allowed, notices would be required to be issued to the proposed respondents..

6. Learned Standing Counsel has submitted that he has no objection in case a direction is issued to the Settlement Officer of Consolidation to decide the impleadment application within stipulated period as directed by this Court.

7. In this conspectus as above, in peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case, no useful purpose would be served to keep the instant writ petition pending. Therefore, this Court deem it appropriate to finally disposed of the present writ petition with direction to Settlement Officer of Consolidation (respondent no. 3) to decide the impleadment application dated 10.03.2025, filed on behalf of the present petitioner in pending appeal, expeditiously preferably within a period of **two months** from the date of production of a certified copy of this order.

8. It is excepted that impleadment application shall be considered and decided, in accordance with law, after giving opportunity of hearing to the parties concerned, without granting unnecessary adjournments.

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)

January 9, 2026
Neetu