



2026:AHC:51575

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 9434 of 2026

Ram Surat And Another

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 8 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Mainuddin Ahamad
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Rameshwar Prasad Shukla

Court No. - 6

HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned counsel for the respondents and perused the record.

2. In view of the order proposed to be passed herein, no useful purpose would be served by putting the private respondent to notice and keeping this petition pending before this Court. However, in case the private respondents feel aggrieved by the order their right to seek modification/variation of the order is being kept reserved.

3. The petitioners have preferred the present petition with the prayer to direct the respondent Nos.2 & 3 to comply with the order dated 5.2.2022 passed in Case No. 4273 of 2021(Computerized Case No. T202115510104273) (Ram Surat vs. State) as well as order dated 5.2.2022 in Case No. 4272 of 2021(Computerized Case No.T202115510104272) (Ram Surat vs. Sakhranj Bal Govind, Kailash) passed by Sub Divisional Magistrate, Sadar Tehsil, Sadar, District Mau under Section 21/24 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 related to Gata No. 973/0.3020 hectare and Gata No. 1061/0.2280 hectare situate in Mauja Achhar, Tehsil Sadar, District Mau.

4. It is argued that considerable time has already been lapsed but till date the aforesaid orders have not been complied.

5. Law has been well settled by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in bunch of writ petitions being leading **Writ C No.35470 of 2025 (Meena**

Devi vs. State of U.P. and 5 others) decided on 18.12.2025, in which certain directions were given in paragraph nos.44 to 46 which reads as follows:-

"44. Section 24 of the UP Revenue Code, 2006 vests the SDO with statutory quasi-judicial powers for summary settlement of boundary disputes coupled with mandatory enforcement authority for demarcation and possession restoration. Execution is not discretionary but integral to the provision's efficacy—failure to enforce renders the entire summary mechanism otiose and defeats the legislative intent. The broad guidelines formulated aim at providing for a structured framework harmonizing statutory mandates (Section 24 of Code, 2006; Rule 22 of Rules, 2016), executive instructions (Government Order dated 16.12.2025), administrative law principles, and constitutional imperatives of fairness and public order. The concerned respondents, in particular the SDO and Collector, are under law bound to ensure that orders under Section 24 are effectively enforced.

45. The Secretary, Department of Revenue, State of Uttar Pradesh, shall ensure statewide circulation of aforesaid guidelines to all revenue authorities within the State. A mechanism for providing mandatory training and RCCMS protocol compliance may also be ensured.

46. The respondents, particularly the concerned SDOs are directed forthwith to execute all subject orders in the instant batch of writ petition, within four weeks from the date of production of a certified copy of this order, strictly as per approved site memo/demarcation report, by ensuring affixation of boundary marks and also possession restoration, wherever required. "

6. In this view of the matter, the present writ petition is **disposed of finally** directing the Sub Divisional Magistrate concerned to comply with

the orders dated 5.2.2022, strictly in accordance with law as well as observations made in the case of **Meena Devi (Supra)** as quoted above unless there is no legal impediment.

(Prakash Padia,J.)

March 13, 2026

P.P.