



2026:AHC:1260

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 5331 of 2025

Rahul Kumar Yadav And 3 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 7 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Naveen Kumar Rai, Viveka Nand Rai

Counsel for Respondent(s) : C.S.C.

Court No. - 55

HON'BLE CHANDRA KUMAR RAI, J.

1. Heard Mr. Vivekanand Rai, learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Standing Counsel for the Standing Counsel.

2. The instant writ petition has been filed for the following relief:-

"(A) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding and direct the respondent no. 2/Hon'ble Member of Board of Revenue U.P. at Prayagraj to decide the Stay Application dated 01.09.2025 in Revision No. 4045 of 2025 (Computer Case No. AL20251429004054) (Rahul Kumar Yadav and others versus State of U.P. and others), Under Section 210 of U.P. Revenue Code 2006, pending before the Respondent no. 2 expeditiously in stipulated time.

(B)- Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding and direct the respondents not to dispossess the petitioners from the land in dispute and maintain the status quo, during the pendency of the Revision before Respondent no. 2."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that revision under Section 210 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 along with stay application filed on behalf of petitioners is pending before board of revenue. He further submitted that caveat application was filed on behalf of contesting respondents before board of revenue. He

further submitted that board of revenue has heard the matter but no order has been passed on the stay application. He submitted that by the order impugned in the revision, the matter has been remitted back before Sub Divisional Officer, as such interim order is required in pending revision, otherwise pending revision will become infructuous. He submitted that proper direction be issued for expeditious disposal for pending revision as well as stay application.

4. I have heard arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record.

5. There is no dispute about the fact that the revision along with stay application filed by the petitioners under Section 210 of U.P. Revenue code, 2006 is pending before respondent No.2-Board of Revenue. There is also no dispute about the fact that no order has been passed on the stay application. There is also no dispute about the fact that by order impugned in revision, the matter has been remitted back before the Sub Divisional Officer.

6. Considering the fact and circumstances of the case, the writ petition is disposed of directing respondent No.2-Board of Revenue to pass necessary order on the stay application within a period of four weeks from the date of production of certified copy of this order. It is further directed that revision itself shall be decided within a period of three months from the date of passing of the order on the stay application.

January 6, 2026

PS*

(Chandra Kumar Rai,J.)