



2026:AHC:23198

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD**

**WRIT - C No. - 2267 of 2026**

Sita Devi

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 9 Others

.....Respondent(s)

---

|                           |   |                    |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Counsel for Petitioner(s) | : | Kailash Nath Singh |
| Counsel for Respondent(s) | : | C.S.C.             |

---

**Court No. - 6**

**HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.**

1. The instant petition has been filed against the judgement and decree dated 16.10.2025 passed by the Upziladhikari, Machhlishahr in the proceedings under Section 116 of U.P. Revenue Code-2006, statutory appeal as provided under Section 207 of 2006, being appeal no. C202514000004755 of 2025 (*Sita Devi Vs. Shakuntala Devi & Ors*), was filed by the petitioner on 19.11.2025.
2. It is argued by the learned counsel for the petitioner that alongwith the said appeal, application for interim protection was also granted.
3. The only relief sought by the petitioner in the present petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is to direct the respondent no. 2 namely Additional Commissioner- Ist Varanasi Division, Varanasi, to pass an appropriate orders on the stay application dated 19.11.2025 filed alongwith the said appeal, as well as Appeal No. 4755 of 2025, being Computer Case No.C202514000004755 (*Sita Devi Vs. Shakuntala Devi & Ors*), under Section 207 of U.P. Revenue Code-2006, expeditiously within specific period.
4. On the other hand it is argued by learned Standing Counsel the respondent no. 2, who decide/pass appropriate orders on the application for interim protection in the pending appeal, expeditiously.
5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused material available on record.

6. In view of the order, proposed to be passed, notices issued to the private respondents dispensed with the liberty them to file an recall application within a period of thirty days, if so advised.

7. The Respondent No. 2 is direct to pass appropriate orders on the application of interim protection expeditiously and preferably within a period of six weeks on the presentation of certified copy of this order, unless there is no legal impediment.

8. In view of the order proposed to be passed herein, no useful purpose would be served by putting the respondent/respondents to notice and keeping this petition pending before this Court. However, in case respondent/respondents feels aggrieved by the order his/her right to seek modification/variation of the order is being kept reserved.

9. From perusal of the record it transpires that nothing has been stated in the entire petition that there is any extraordinary situation nor any arguments has been made in this regard by the learned counsel for the petitioner to direct the trial court to decide the aforesaid case in a time bound manner except the fact that suit is filed in the year 2023.

10. In view of the above, no relief could be granted to the petitioner. However, trial court is expected to decide the aforesaid case strictly in accordance with law within a period of **six weeks** without granting any unnecessary adjournment to either of the parties unless there is no legal impediment.

11. With the aforesaid observations, the petition is **disposed of**.

**February 2, 2026**

*Vinod.*

**(Prakash Padia, J.)**