



2026:AHC:30160

## HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 4524 of 2026

Shatrujeet Yadav

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

---

|                           |   |                                   |
|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Counsel for Petitioner(s) | : | Deepankar Chaudhary, Shivam Singh |
| Counsel for Respondent(s) | : | C.S.C.                            |

---

**Court No. - 6**

**HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.**

1. The petitioner earlier approached this Court by moving a petition being Writ C No.10242 of 2025, which was disposed of vide order dated 16.04.2025. The order dated 16.04.2025 :-

"1. Heard learned Counsel for the parties and perused the record.

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

"to issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus, commanding and directing the respondent no.2 & 3 to decide the representation of the petitioner dated 21.12.2024 (Annexure No.1)."

3. Learned Standing Counsel has raised a preliminary objection that petitioner has an alternative remedy to approach appropriate authority by moving an application under Section 67 of the Uttar Pradesh Revenue Code, 2006 in view of the judgments passed by this Court in case of Jahar Singh v. State of U.P. reported in 2017(4) ADJ 619 as well as in Kanhaiya Lal Vs. State of U.P. and others reported in 2023 (12) ADJ 226.

4. Since the petitioner has an alternative remedy, I am not inclined to entertain the instant petition.

5. In case, the petitioner moves an application under Section 67 of Uttar Pradesh Revenue Code, 2006, before appropriate authority, the same shall be decided after hearing all the concerned parties in accordance with law.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of."

2. It is argued by counsel for the petitioner that pursuant to the aforesaid letter dated 30.10.2025 was written by the petitioner to the District Magistrate, Maharajganj (annexure-1 to the writ petition) since no decision has been taken hence present writ petition has been filed.

3. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the records.

4. After going through the records, the Court is of the opinion that it was found by the Court that the application submitted by the petitioner before the respondent no.2 was not in accordance with law hence direction was already given by this Court vide order dated 16.04.2025. The relief sought for could not be granted. However, it is made clear that in case petitioner will submit a proper application before the concerned competent authority as per Section 67 of the U.P. Revenue Code, the authority concerned is directed to decide the same expeditiously in accordance with law, if there is no legal impediment.

**(Prakash Padia,J.)**

**February 11, 2026**

Pramod Tripathi