



2026:AHC:28794

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 1143 of 2026

Rajesh Kumar And 4 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 5 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Som Pal
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 6

HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.

1. The petitioners have preferred present writ petition inter-alia with the prayer to direct the respondent authorities to comply with the order dated 20.08.2025 passed by the Additional Collector/Tehsildar, Tehsil-Bisalpur, district-Pilibhit/respondent no.4.

2. It reveals from perusal of the record that proceedings under Section 67 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 was initiated by the Gram Sabha against the respondent no.6 namely Tej Bahadur. In the said proceedings an order of eviction as well as damages has been passed by the respondent no.4 on 20.08.2025.

3. It is argued by counsel for the petitioners that for compliance of aforesaid order representations were made by the petitioners along-with others before the revenue authorities on 30.12.2025, copy of which is appended as annexure-5 to the writ petition. It is further argued that aforesaid representations were sent by registered post AD on 31.12.2025 since no action has been taken hence present writ petition.

4. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel for the respondent-State and Sri S. B. Singh, learned counsel for the respondent no.5 and perused the records.

5. From perusal of the record it transpires that for compliance of the order dated 20.08.2025 passed by respondent no.4 representations were made by the petitioners before the revenue authorities on 30.12.2025. According to counsel for the petitioners aforesaid representations were

sent by registered post for the first time on 31.12.2025. From perusal of the affidavit appended alongwith writ petition it is clear that petitioners approached this Court specially petitioner no.1-Rajesh Kumar on 06.01.2026 itself, which is clear from the photo sticker appended alongwith the affidavit, thereafter affidavit was sworn on 07.01.2026.

6. It is settled law that for approaching the Courts to issue a writ of mandamus parties should wait for a considerable time though in the present case immediately after moving the representations without waiting for a considerable time petitioners approached this Court.

7. Apart from the same, nothing has been stated in the entire writ petition nor any argument has been raised that what prejudice has been caused to the petitioners.

8. In view of the above, the writ petition lacks merit and is hereby dismissed.

(Prakash Padia,J.)

February 10, 2026
Pramod Tripathi