



2026:AHC:49252-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 51 of 2026

Rajesh Chauhan

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and 5 others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Amit Kumar Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Meenakshi Singh (A.C.S.C.), Dhirendra Singh, Rameshwar Prasad Shukla, Sanjay Kumar Om

Chief Justice's Court

HON'BLE ARUN BHANSALI, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE KSHITIJ SHAILENDRA, J.

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking a direction to the respondents to ensure uninterrupted construction of the overhead water tank in Village - Siyabasti, District-Mau.
2. Submissions have been made that the water tank was sanctioned and was being constructed, wherein the boring was already complete, however, on account of a litigation initiated by respondent No. 6 against whom, an order under Section 67 of the Uttar Pradesh Revenue Code, 2006 was passed, wherein the High Court had specifically ordered that the construction of the overhead water tank to continue, the respondents, for no apparent reason, have stopped the construction work.
3. Instructions have been produced on behalf of Uttar Pradesh Jal Nigam (Gramin), *inter alia*, though referring to the fact that this Court had permitted construction of the overhead water tank over the land in dispute, only on account of the pendency of the said litigation, it is claimed that the construction is not taking place.
4. The action and attitude of the respondents despite a clear indication made in the order passed in the litigation initiated by respondent No. 6 that the construction shall continue, cannot be comprehended.
5. It appears that the officers of the respondent - Jal Nigam are seeking to support respondent No. 6, wherein despite grant of interim order and

requiring construction to continue, the same has been stopped. The action of the officers cannot be countenanced/permitted.

6. The Managing Director, Uttar Pradesh Jal Nigam (Gramin) is directed to look into the matter/the conduct of the Executive Engineer in not continuing with the construction contrary to the directions of the Court.

7. Further, the respondent-Executive Engineer is directed to continue with the construction and respondent No. 6 is directed not to create any hindrance in the construction being undertaken in terms of the order passed in the writ petition filed by the said respondent No. 6.

8. With the above directions, the petition stands disposed of.

(Kshitij Shailendra,J.) (Arun Bhansali,CJ.)

March 11, 2026

Mukesh Pal/Sazia