



2026:AHC:21717

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 1827 of 2026

Chandra Dev

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 8 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Anuj Kumar Yadav, Ashok Kumar Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: Bhupendra Kumar Tripathi, C.S.C.

Court No. - 6

HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents-State, Sri B. K. Tripathi, learned counsel for the respondent no.4 and perused the records.

2. The petitioner has preferred present writ petition inter-alia with the following prayers :-

"(1) issue a writ, order of direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent no.3 Sub Divisional Officer Saidpur to ensure fixing of pillars on the boundaries, taking in view the Demarcation Report alongwith Field Book dated 10.5.2025 finalized under order dated 15.7.2025 passed by him in Case No.4462 of 2025, (Computer Case No.T-202514290404462), Chandradev versus Vanshraj & others under Section 24 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 (contained in Annexure No.5 to writ petition);

(II) issue a writ, order of direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent no.3 Sub Divisional Officer Saidpur to provide possession to the petitioner over entire area of land of Plot No.243 area 0.0950 hectares situate in Mauja Rafipur, Pargana & Tehsil Saidpur, District Ghazipur;"

3. It is argued by counsel for the petitioner that vide order dated 15.07.2025 respondent no.3-Sub Divisional Officer, Tehsil-Saidpur, District Ghazipur has directed the authority concerned to fix the boundary of the land but till date no action has been taken.

4. Coordinate Bench of this Court in bunch of writ petitions being leading **Writ C No.35470 of 2025 (Meena Devi vs. State of U.P. and 5 others)** decided on 18.12.2025, certain directions were given in paragraph nos.44 to 46 which reads as follows:-

"44. Section 24 of the UP Revenue Code, 2006 vests the SDO with statutory quasi-judicial powers for summary settlement of boundary disputes coupled with mandatory enforcement authority for demarcation and possession restoration. Execution is not discretionary but integral to the provision's efficacy—failure to enforce renders the entire summary mechanism otiose and defeats the legislative intent. The broad guidelines formulated aim at providing for a structured framework harmonizing statutory mandates (Section 24 of Code, 2006; Rule 22 of Rules, 2016), executive instructions (Government Order dated 16.12.2025), administrative law principles, and constitutional imperatives of fairness and public order. The concerned respondents, in particular the SDO and Collector, are under law bound to ensure that orders under Section 24 are effectively enforced.

45. The Secretary, Department of Revenue, State of Uttar Pradesh, shall ensure statewide circulation of aforesaid guidelines to all revenue authorities within the State. A mechanism for providing mandatory training and RCCMS protocol compliance may also be ensured.

46. The respondents, particularly the concerned SDOs are directed forthwith to execute all subject orders in the instant batch of writ petition, within four weeks from the date of production of a certified copy of this order, strictly as per approved site memo/demarcation report, by ensuring affixation of boundary marks and also possession restoration, wherever required. "

5. In this view of the matter, present writ petition is disposed of finally directing the Respondent No.3-Sub Divisional Officer, Tehsil-Saidpur, District Ghazipur to comply with the order dated 15.07.2025,

strictly in accordance with law as well as observations made in the case of **Meena Devi (Supra)** as quoted above.

(Prakash Padia,J.)

January 30, 2026
Pramod Tripathi