



2026:AHC-LKO:13657-DB

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 150 of 2026

Seema Rajput

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

U.O.I. through the Secretary, Ministry of Road
Transport and Highway, New Delhi and 3 others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Lakshmana Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: A.S.G.I., V.P. Nag, S.C., Sarvesh Kumar Dubey, Ambrish Rai, C.G.C.

Chief Justice's Court

**HON'BLE ARUN BHANSALI, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE JASPREET SINGH, J.**

1. This petition, purportedly in public interest, has been filed by the petitioner seeking a direction to opposite party no. 2 to construct an underpass on the eastward road of the village Gaurishankarpur Grant, Tehsil & District Unnao to Naya Khera Chauraha.
2. Submissions have been made that on account of construction of Lucknow - Kanpur Expressway for lack of underpass, the villagers of the village, are having huge inconvenience and therefore, the respondents may be directed to construct the underpass.
3. A perusal of the record indicates that the petitioner had earlier approached this Court by filing Public Interest Litigation No. 669 of 2024, which came to be decided on 23.08.2024, wherein the statement of counsel for respondent - NHAI was noticed indicating construction of two underpasses at chainage 54.28 and 54.25 were proposed.
4. Based on the said submissions, the petition was disposed of and further observations were made that in future if any cause of action arises, it would be open for the petitioner or such other persons who may have a cause to approach this Court.
5. Submissions now are being made that two underpasses constructed, are at some distance from the village in question and therefore, the

respondents be directed to construct an underpass closer to the village.

6. We have considered the submissions made by counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

7. The petitioner in the earlier petition, had made specific prayer pertaining to the construction of underpass at a particular place. The Court having noticed the construction of two underpasses by the respondents, did not find any reason to proceed further with the matter and the petition was disposed of.

8. Filing a fresh petition with the same cause of action based on the liberty granted by the Court cannot be countenanced inasmuch as the liberty apparently was confined to the fact of the respondents not undertaking the construction as was indicated in their response. The liberty cannot be utilized for filing a fresh petition all over again seeking the same relief, which was claimed in the earlier petition.

9. In view of the above, we do not find any reason to entertain the present second Public Interest Litigation on the same subject matter. The same stands **dismissed**.

(Jaspreet Singh, J) (Arun Bhansali, CJ)

February 20, 2026

Rakesh/nd