



2026:AHC:24999

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 4384 of 2026

Dharamjeet Budhuram Pasi @ Dharmjeet Ram
Budhuram Pasi

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Jigyasa Singh, Navin Kumar
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 6

HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel for the respondent-State and perused the record.

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

3. The basic relief sought by the petitioner in the present petition is to direct the respondent no.4-Tehsildar, Martinganj, District Azamgarh to decide Case No.4166/2024, Computer Case No.T202415060804166 expeditiously.

4. It is argued by counsel for the petitioner that earlier petitioner approached this Court by filing a petition being Writ C No.26692 of 2024 in which following order was passed by this Court on 2.12.2024 :-

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

2. The present petition has been filed with the following prayer:

"a) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing respondent no. 4 to execute the order dated 3.11.2023 passed by respondent no. 4 (which is Annexure as Annexure No. 6);

b) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing respondent no. 1 to 4 to remove the illegal encroachment of respondent no. 5 on Chak Marg."

3. Learned Standing Counsel has raised a preliminary objection that the petitioner has an alternative remedy to approach appropriate authority by moving an application under Section 26 of the Uttar Pradesh

Revenue Code, 2006 in view of the judgment passed by this Court in Jahar Singh v. State of U.P. reported in 2017(4) ADJ 619 as well as in Kanhaiya Lal v. 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 26 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. With the aforesaid observation, the petition is disposed of."

5. It is argued that pursuant to the aforesaid application under Section 24 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 was filed by the petitioner before the respondent no.4, which was numbered as Case No.4166 of 2024 in which various dates were fixed but till date no final decision has been taken hence present writ petition.

6. In the facts and circumstances of the case, the present petition is disposed of directing the respondent no.4 to decide the aforesaid case strictly in accordance with law most expeditiously and preferably within a period of four months but without granting unnecessary adjournment unless there is no legal impediment.

(Prakash Padia,J.)

February 4, 2026

Pramod Tripathi