



2026:AHC:20795

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 1658 of 2026

Geeta Devi

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 7 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Deepesh Kumar Ojha, Ichhvaku Pratap Shahi
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C.

Court No. - 6

HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.

1. Heard counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of Respondent Nos.1 to 7 and perused the record.
2. In view of the order proposed to be passed today, notices need not be issued to the private respondents.
3. It is stated in the writ petition that earlier the petitioner filed a Case No.1006 of 2024 (Smt. Geeta Devi vs. Gram Panchayat) under Section 24 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006. On the said application, an order dated 29.02.2024 was passed by him. By the aforesaid order, application filed by the petitioner under Section 24 was allowed. Thereafter the private-respondents started interfering in the peaceful possession of the petitioner. In this regard undated application was submitted by the petitioner before the Respondent No.4, copy of which is appended as Annexure-3 to the writ petition.
4. It is argued that on the aforesaid application the remarks were made by the Respondent No.4 directing the authorities to comply with the order passed by him dated 29.02.2024. It is argued that inspite of the same, till date no decision has been taken, hence the present writ petition.
5. 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. "

6. In this view of the matter, the present writ petition is **disposed of finally** directing the Respondent No.4 to comply with the order dated 29.02.2024, 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
Swati