



2026:AHC:25065

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 1428 of 2025

Doodhnath

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Rajesh Kumar Srivastava, Saurabh Srivastava
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 54

HON'BLE DINESH PATHAK, J.

1. Heard Sri Saurabh Srivastava, learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondents.

2. The instant petition has been filed assailing the legality and validity of the notification dated 21.07.2023 issued under Section 4-A(2) of the U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act published on 09.09.2023. It is submitted that the previous consolidation operations in the area were finalized in the year 1978 and that since then, no major changes have been occurred on the spot. Therefore, a fresh consolidation operation is not required and the impugned notification under Section 4A(2) of the U.P.C.H. Act is not sustainable in law.

3. Learned Standing Counsel submits that the grievance of the present petitioner can more appropriately be redressed by the Consolidation Officer, U.P. Allahabad on the fresh representation to be moved by him and he has no objection in case a direction is issued for expeditious disposal of the fresh representation.

4. In this conspectus, as above, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the instant writ petition pending. Therefore, the same is hereby finally decided, without entering into merits of the case, with a direction that petitioner is at liberty to move a fresh representation before the Consolidation Commissioner (respondent no. 2) along with the certified copy of the order of the date and self-attested copy of the instant writ petition, who shall consider and decide the said representation in accordance

with law, expeditiously, preferably within a period of **six months** from the date of receiving a fresh representation, as mentioned above.

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)

February 2, 2026
Neetu