



2026:AHC:21956

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 1977 of 2025

Rajkaran

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Suresh Yadav
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 54

HON'BLE DINESH PATHAK, J.

1. This writ petition has been filed, inter alia, seeking the following relief:

"i) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the authorities concerned to decide the representation of the petitioner dated 27.04.2023 in view of the order dated 28.04.2009 passed by Assistant Consolidation Officer in case no 151 directed that in Khata no. 1026/Gata no. 5180 measuring area 1.08 Hec otherwise, Gata no. 480 measuring area .03 Hec. Gata no. 5374 measuring area 0.92 Hec, Gata no. 5376 measuring area 0.35 Hec, Gata no. 4706 measuring area 0.12. Hec, Gata no. 4708 measuring area 0.08 Hec, Gata no. 4684 measuring area 0.06 Hec, Gata no. 4685 measuring area 0.08 Hec, Gata no. 4687 measuring area 0.14 Hec, Gata no. 5163 measuring area 1.04 Hec, Gata no. 5175 measuring area 1.01 Hec, Gata no. 5185 measuring area 1.48 Hec, Gata no. 5186 measuring area 0.07 Hec, Gata no. 4668/2 measuring area 0.06 Hec, Gata no. 4670/2 measuring area 0.1 Hec, total 15 number 6.23 Acres 1/6 share seller Chhota Son of Ram Kumar name be deleted on the basis of sale deed no 216 dated 04.02.2009 and the name of Sumitra Wife of Rajkaran be incorporated otherwise the applicant/ petitioner shall suffer irreparable loss and injury.

ii) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the Collector/ District Magistrate Banda, District Banda (respondent no. 2) to decide the representation of the petitioner dated 27.04.2023(Annexure no. 4) and mutate the name of petitioner and his heirs in the revenue records."

2. Grievance of the petitioner is that the State authorities are not giving effect to the order dated 28.04.2009 passed by Assistant Consolidation Officer under the provisions of law as enunciated under Section 6(2) of U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act.

3. It is submitted that unit/village in question has been de-notified under Section 6(1) of U.P.C.H. Act. Before cancellation of the consolidation operation under Section 6(1) of U.P.C.H. Act, order dated 28.04.2009 passed by Assistant Consolidation Officer has attained finality inasmuch as same has not been challenged before any competent court by any party. Therefore, State authorities are under legal obligation to implement the said order in land record in pursuance of the provisions of law as enunciated under Section 6(2) of U.P.C.H. Act.

4. Learned Standing Counsel has contended that the grievance of the petitioner can more appropriately be redressed by the Deputy Director of Consolidation, who may be directed to decide the fresh representation, to be moved by the petitioner showing his grievance, within a stipulated period as fixed by this Court.

5. In this conspectus, as above, no useful purpose would be served to keep this matter pending, therefore, this court deems it appropriate to finally dispose of the present writ petition, without considering the merits of the case, with liberty to the petitioner to file a fresh representation before the District Magistrate/District Deputy Director of Consolidation (respondent no.2) with respect to his grievances, as mentioned in the present writ petition, within a period of two weeks from today along with a certified copy of this order and self attested copy of the present writ petition, who shall, either himself or through the authority competent, as required under the law, consider and decide the same in accordance with law expeditiously, preferably, within a period of three months thereafter, if there is no any other legal impediment.

6. With the aforesaid observation, present writ petition is disposed of.

February 2, 2026

vkg

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)