



2026:AHC:48457

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 692 of 2026

Lalta Prasad

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Deputy Director Of Consolidation Bareilly And 8
Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Vijaya Shankar Shukla
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 54

HON'BLE DINESH PATHAK, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondents and perused the record.
2. The instant writ petition has arisen out of proceedings under Section 21(1) of the UP Consolidation of Holdings Act (in brevity, 'UPCH Act').
3. In the provisional consolidation scheme, the petitioner has been proposed chak No. 189 at two places; first over plot No. 33/1, area 0.652 hectare, and second chak over plots No. 75 and 76/1, area 0.150 hectare, the total area is 0.802 hectare. Having been aggrieved with his second chak, The present petitioner moved an application/objection under Section 21(1) of UPCH Act seeking adjustment of the exchange value of the second chak with his first chak over plot No. 33/1. The Consolidation Officer, vide order dated 08.11.2024, dismissed the objection with an observation that the remaining chak holders would be deprived of their original holdings. The order passed by the Consolidation Officer has been affirmed by the Settlement Officer of Consolidation and the Deputy Director of Consolidation, upon appeal and revision respectively filed by the present petitioner. All the consolidation courts have returned a categorical finding that the petitioner has been proposed his first chak over plot No. 33/1 including his boring and it is not feasible to shift the exchange value of the second chak of the petitioner to his first chak over plot No. 33/1, inasmuch as, the same would adversely affect the remaining chak holders, who would be allotted Udan chak and would be displaced from their original holdings. It is apposite to mention that the plot No. 33/1 and plot No. 75 are the original holdings of the present petitioner

and he has been proposed both the chaks over his original holdings. The concurrent findings of fact returned by all the three consolidation courts have not been refuted by the petitioner in the instant writ petition.

4. In this conspectus, as above, I do not find any justifiable ground to entertain the instant writ petition or interfere with the orders passed by the consolidation courts. The findings returned by the consolidation courts are based on appreciation of the material on record and do not suffer from any illegality, irregularity, perversity or infirmity so as to warrant the indulgence of this Court in exercise of its extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. There is nothing on record to demonstrate as to how the petitioner has prejudiced, or if there is any likelihood of causing miscarriage of justice to him, owing to the orders impugned.

5. Resultantly, the instant writ petition, being misconceived and devoid of merits, is dismissed with no order as to the costs.

March 10, 2026

vinay

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)