



2026:AHC:43895

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 737 of 2026

Dashrath

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 16 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Pramod Kumar Singh, Tripathi
B.G.Bhai
Counsel for Respondent(s) : C.S.C.

Court No. - 55

HON'BLE CHANDRA KUMAR RAI, J.

1. Heard Sri Tripathi B.G. Bhai, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri T.P. Gupta, learned standing counsel for the state-respondents.

2. The instant writ petition has been filed for the following relief:-

"Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus, commanding the respondent no.2 to decide the Case No.REV/5416/2024, Siddharth Nagar (Computerized Case No.AL20141763005416) (Dahrath and Another vs. State of U.P. and Others), under Section 210 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006, within the stipulated period."

3. Counsel for the petitioner states that name of the petitioner's father was ordered to be recorded in the place of deceased- Sampati in proper manner. He submitted that restoration application filed by father of private respondent nos.5/1 to 5/4 was allowed and the mutation case, has been decided in illegal manner in maintaining the order of Revenue Inspector dated 28.12.2020 which is illegal exercise of jurisdiction. He submitted that against the order of mutation court, appeal filed by the petitioner has been dismissed. He submitted that in revision filed by the petitioner before the Board of Revenue, no interim order has been granted. He submitted that appropriate direction be issued for the expeditious disposal of the pending revision and till the pendency of the revision, interim protection be granted in favour of the petitioner. He placed reliance on a decision of

this Court reported in **2007 (102) RD 498, Ali Sher Vs. State of U.P. Through Collector, Bijnor and Others** in support of his submission.

4. On the other hand, learned Addl. C.S.C. submitted that petitioner's revision is pending, as such, the writ petition is not maintainable and the petitioner should approach the revisional court for redressal of his grievance.

5. I have considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties and perused the records.

6. There is no dispute about the fact that the revision arising out of the proceeding under Section 34 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 filed by the petitioner is pending before the revisional court/Board of Revenue.

7. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent no.2/Board of Revenue, U.P. at Prayagraj to decide the revision, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 2 months, from the date of production of a certified copy of this order before the authority concerned, after affording opportunity of hearing to the parties concerned, in accordance with law.

February 26, 2026

C.Prakash

(Chandra Kumar Rai,J.)