



2026:AHC:11577

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 2276 of 2025

Dharambir Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Arvind Kumar Verma, Mahesh Sharma
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 for the State respondents and perused the record.

2. The instant petition has been filed seeking, inter alia, for the following relief:-

"I. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to make an entry and correct the recent revenue record in respect of order dated 25.10.1990 passed by Settlement Officer of Consolidation, Bijnor Camp, Bulandshahr in Appeal No. 76/582/1561, Ram Chandra Vs. State of U.P. and others, under the provisions of Section 6(2) of U.P. Consolidation and Holdings Act and direct the respondents to issue the copy of fresh Khatauni of Khata No. 00058 Khet No. 70, Village Dhakauli, Pargana and Tehsil: Syana, District: Bulandshahr."

2. Grievance of the petitioner is that the State authorities are not giving effect to the order dated 25.10.1990 passed by Settlement Officer of Consolidation under the provisions of law as enunciated under Section 6(2) of U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act.

3. It is submitted that unit/village in question has been de-notified under Section 6(1) of U.P.C.H. Act. Before cancellation of the consolidation operation under Section 6(1) of U.P.C.H. Act, order dated 25.10.1990 passed by the Settlement Officer of Consolidation has attained finality, inasmuch as, same has not been challenged before any competent court by any party. Therefore, State authorities are under legal obligation to implement the said order in land record in pursuance of the provisions of law as enunciated under Section 6(2) of U.P.C.H. Act.

4. Learned Standing Counsel has contended that the grievance of the petitioner can more appropriately be redressed by the Deputy Director of Consolidation, who may be directed to decide the fresh representation, to be moved by the petitioner showing his grievance, within a stipulated period as fixed by this Court.

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 considering the merits of the case, with liberty to the petitioner to file a fresh representation before respondent no.3 (Deputy Director of Consolidation) with respect to his grievances, as mentioned in the present writ petition, within a period of two weeks from today along with a certified copy of this order and self attested copy of the present writ petition, who shall, either himself or through the authority competent, as required under the law, consider and decide the same in accordance with law expeditiously, preferably, within a period of three months thereafter, if there is no any other legal impediment.

6. With the aforesaid observation, present writ petition is disposed of.

January 16, 2026

Neetu

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)