



2026:AHC:50865

## HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 973 of 2026

Prem Shankar And 2 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 6 Others

.....Respondent(s)

---

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Pramod Kumar Sinha

Counsel for Respondent(s) : Arun Kumar Pandey, Arvind  
Srivastava Iii, C.S.C.

---

**Court No. - 55**

**HON'BLE CHANDRA KUMAR RAI, J.**

1. Heard Mr. P.K. Sinha, learned counsel for the petitioners, Mr. Arvind Srivastava Iii and Mr. Ashish Kumar, learned counsel for respondent Nos.5 and 6, Mr. Muneshwar Singh, learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondents and Mr. Arun Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for respondent No.7-Gram Sabha,

2. The instant public interest litigation has been filed for the following relief:-

***"I. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Certiorari calling for the records and quashing the impugned order dated 12.01.2026 passed in Revision Case No. REV/5565/2025/Rampur, (Computerized Case No.R20251359005565) Vishesh Kumar & Others Vs. Prem Shankar by the respondent No.2 COURT Under Section 210 of the U.P. Revenue Code 2006. (Annexure No. 1 to the writ petition).***

***II. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding the respondents not to interfere in possession of the petitioners in pursuance of the impugned stay order dated 12.01.2026 passed in Revision Case No. REV/5565/2025/Rampur, (Computerized Case***

***No.R20251359005565) Vishesh Kumar & Others Vs.  
Prem Shankar passed by the respondent No. 2."***

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that proceeding under Section 24 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 was initiated at the instance of the father of the petitioners, which was decided in accordance with law on the basis of report submitted by the authorities in the proceeding. He submitted that appeal under Section 24 (4) of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 filed by private respondents was dismissed by Commissioner vide order dated 18.11.2025. He submitted that revision under Section 210 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 was filed on behalf of respondent nos.5 and 6. He submitted that on the date fixed in the revision i.e. 12.1.2026 learned counsel appearing for petitioner was present in the court of board of revenue, but matter was not taken up and date was fixed for 19.1.2026. He submitted that without any opportunity afforded to learned counsel for the petitioner order dated 12.1.2026 was passed by Board of Revenue entertaining the revision and granting interim order in the revision. He placed the documents annexed along with the writ petition in order to demonstrate that on 12.1.2026 matter was adjourned for 19.1.2026. He further submitted that impugned order dated 12.1.2026 should be set aside and matter be sent back before Board of Revenue for considering the matter for admission as well as grant of interim order after affording opportunity of hearing to the parties.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent No.6 submitted that matter was mentioned before board of revenue on 12.1.2026 and on the mention made by learned counsel for the private respondents matter was entertained and interim protection was granted. He submitted that documents annexed as Annexure No.8 to the petitioner is not authentic documents, as such same cannot be taken into consideration. He further submitted that there is no illegality in the impugned order entertaining the revision and granting interim protection by the board of revenue.

5. I have considered the arguments advanced by the learned

counsel for the parties and perused the record.

6. There is no dispute about the fact that proceeding under section 24 (4) of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 at the instance of father was decided and order has been maintained in appeal. There is also no dispute about the fact that revision filed by private respondentd has been entertained and interim protection has been granted.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, interest of justice will be served if board of revenue be directed to decide the revision within stipulated period and parties be directed to maintain status quo on spot as prevailing today in addition to the interim order dated 12.1.2026 granted by board of revenue.

8. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, **the writ petition is finally disposed of** directing respondent no.2- Board of Revenue U.P, Lucknow to decide the aforementioned revision under section 210 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 after affording opportunity of hearing to the parties expeditiously preferably within a period of three months from the date of production of certified copy of this order before him. It is further directed that parties are directed to maintain status quo as prevailing today in respect to the plot in question till the pendency of the aforementioned revision before board of revenue in addition to interim order dated 12.1.2026 passed by board of revenue.

**March 10, 2026**

PS\*

**(Chandra Kumar Rai,J.)**