



2026:AHC:26002

## HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 498 of 2026

Chhatthu Yadav

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

---

|                           |   |                |
|---------------------------|---|----------------|
| Counsel for Petitioner(s) | : | Pankaj Goswami |
| 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 representing State and perused the record.

2. Being aggrieved by the consolidation operation in village Pipra Bitthal, Pargana-Salempur Majhauri, Tehsil Bhatpar Rani, District Deoria, the petitioner has filed instant writ petition seeking relief for cancellation of the aforesaid consolidation operation.

3. It has been submitted that the petitioner has already approached before the Hon'ble Supreme Court, who has passed the order dated 22.09.2025, which is reproduced hereinunder:

*"1. Delay condoned.*

*2. The petitioner is a resident of village Pipra Bitthal, Bhatpar Rani, District Deoria, Uttar Pradesh. According to him, consolidation in the village had taken place in the year 1984, and was given effect to by handing over possession to all the proprietors and non-proprietors of the village. However, a fresh notification was issued on 21.09.2013, in purported exercise of powers under Section 4-A of the U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1953 for afresh consolidation of the above-stated village. Some residents of the village protested against the fresh process, and they eventually approached the High Court, A direction to consider their representation, etc., were made, and as a result thereto, no step was taken by the Consolidation Authorities from 2015 till 24.08.2022, i.e., the date when the Deputy Director (Consolidation) appointed the consolidation officers. The Authorities, thereafter, started consolidation exercise on 22.02.2024.*

*3. It is in this backdrop that the petitioner filed a PIL before the High Court, which has been summarily dismissed vide the impugned order, observing that the petitioner*

*being one of the land holders in the village, is an interested person and, thus, no PIL is maintainable at his instance. The aggrieved petitioner is before us.*

*4. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.*

*5. It seems that the petitioner had not approached the Consolidation Authorities so far, inter alia, to point out that after the consolidation concluded in 1984, more than 90% of the villagers are satisfied and they are not keen on the consolidation proceedings being reopened. Such a petition may be filed by the petitioner, if so advised, under the U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1953 and the same shall be duly considered by the Consolidation Officer/Deputy Director (Consolidation), as the case may be. If the Authorities do not find merit in the petitioner's application, liberty is granted to him to approach the Higher Authorities, including the High Court in his individual capacity. Ordered accordingly.*

*6. The Special Leave Petition is disposed of with liberty as aforesaid.*

*7. All pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of."*

4. It has been submitted that in pursuance of the order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the petitioner has made several representations to Deputy Director of Consolidation, however, till date, no action has been taken.

5. Learned Standing Counsel has contended that the grievance of the petitioner with regard to the cancellation of the notification under Section 4(2) of UP Consolidation of Holdings Act can more appropriately be redressed by Commissioner of Consolidation, Lucknow (respondent No. 3), and he has no objection, in case, a direction is issued to decide a fresh representation to be moved by the present petitioner within stipulated period, as may be directed by this Court.

6. In this conspectus, as above, no useful purpose would be served to keep this matter pending, therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to finally dispose of the present writ petition, without making any observation on the merits of the case, as mentioned in the present writ petition, with liberty to the petitioner to move a detailed representation with respect to his grievances, as mentioned in the instant writ petition, before the Director of Consolidation/Commissioner of Consolidation, Lucknow, along with a self attested copy of the instant writ petition, within a period of three weeks from today, who shall, thereafter, consider and decide the same, after conducting due enquiry as required, in accordance with law, expeditiously, preferably, within a period of five months from the date of production of a certified

copy of this order along with a copy of the representation, if any, provided there is no legal impediment.

7. With the aforesaid direction, present writ petition is **disposed of**.

**February 5, 2026**  
vinay

**(Dinesh Pathak,J.)**