



2026:AHC:10333

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 105 of 2026

Badam Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Deputy Director Of Consolidation Farrukhabad And 20
Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Agnivesh, Jadu Nandan 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. Instant writ petition has arisen out of an impleadment application dated 15.11.2019 moved by Sheel Chandra (respondent no.2) in proceedings under Section 9A(2) of the U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1953 (in brevity 'UPCH Act'), registered as Case No.1229 of 2022 (State Vs. Revti and others). The Consolidation Officer (in brevity 'CO'), vide order dated 26.04.2025, rejected the impleadment application. However, the Deputy Director of Consolidation (in brevity 'DDC'), upon revision being filed on behalf of the respondent no.2, allowed the same and permitted the respondent no.2 to be impleaded in the proceedings under Section 9A(2) of the UPCH Act, vide order dated 16.12.2025, which is under challenge before this Court.

3. Having been considered the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Standing Counsel for the State respondents and upon perusal of the record, it is manifest that two co-sharers of Khata No. 296, namely, Smt. Revati and Smt. Makhano had executed registered sale deeds dated 10.02.2015 and 25.04.2015, respectively, to the extent of their respective shares, in favour of respondent no.2. In pursuance thereof, the name of the vendee has been recorded over chak nos. 900 and 759 respectively. During the consolidation operations, an objection under Section 9A(2) of the UPCH Act was filed for determination of the shares amongst the co-tenure holders. During the pendency of the aforesaid proceedings under Section 9A(2) of the UPCH Act, Sheel Chandra

(respondent no.2) filed an impleadment application dated 15.11.2019 on the basis of the registered sale deeds dated 10.02.2015 and 25.04.2015, respectively, seeking his impleadment and determination of his share to the extent of the subject matter of the aforesaid two sale deeds. The CO declined to implead the respondent no.2 in the original proceedings, holding that determination of shares of the vendors would ipso facto determine the share of the impleadment applicant (vendee); therefore, he did not deserve to be impleaded in the proceedings. The DDC, while allowing the revision preferred on behalf of respondent no.2, has rightly observed that the rights and title of the co-tenure holders were transferred to the vendee and they have no interest to pursue the litigation; therefore, vendee deserves to be impleaded to protect his right, title and interest in the disputed property. The entries made in favour of the respondent no.2 over chak no. 900 and 759 are admitted to both the parties. Therefore, denying the impleadment of the respondent no.2 in the proceedings under Section 9A(2) of the UPCH Act, which are pending adjudication for determination of the shares of the co-sharers in Khata no. 296, would severely prejudice the interest of the respondent no.2.

4. In this conspectus, as above, I am of the considered view that the DDC has rightly allowed the revision, thereby permitting the respondent no.2 to be impleaded in the original proceedings under Section 9A(2) of the UPCH Act being a vendee from two co-sharers recorded in Khata no. 296. Depriving the respondent no.2 of an opportunity to contest the title proceedings would defeat the ends of justice and may lead to multiplicity of proceedings. There is no illegality, perversity or infirmity in the order under challenge before this court warranting interference in exercise of its extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. There is nothing on the record to demonstrate as to how the petitioner has been prejudiced, or if there is any likelihood of causing miscarriage of justice to him, owing to the order under challenge.

5. Resultantly, instant writ petition, being misconceived and devoid on merit is **dismissed** with no orders as to the costs.

January 16, 2026
vkg

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)