



2026:AHC:55683

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 10161 of 2026

Meera Devi

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 9 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Akhilesh Kumar Dwivedi, Ramesh Chandra Tripathi
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C., Rameshwar Prasad Shukla

Court No. - 6

HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.

1. In the proceedings initiated by the petitioner under Section 24 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 being Case No.01480 of 2022 (Computerized Case No.T202215510301480), order dated 29.01.2024 had been passed by the respondent No.3/Sub Divisional Officer, Madhuban District Mau in favour of the petitioner. Aggrieved with the aforesaid order, private respondents had filed revision being Revision No.2131 of 2025 which was dismissed by the respondent No.2/Commissioner Azamgarh Division Azamgarh vide order dated 07.01.2026. The operative portion of the order dated 07.01.2026 reads as follows:-

5- अतः निगरानीकर्ता द्वारा प्रस्तुत निगरानी पोषणीय नहीं पाये जाने के कारण ग्राह्यता स्तर पर ही निरस्त की जाती है। अवर न्यायालय को निर्देशित किया जाता है कि आदेश दिनांक 29.01.2024 के अनुपालन में पुलिस बल की सहायता से 10 दिन में विपक्षी को कब्जा दिलाना सुनिश्चित करें। बाद आवश्यक कार्यवाही इस न्यायालय की पत्रावली दाखिल दफ्तर होवे।

2. It is argued by learned counsel for the petitioner that despite the aforequoted direction, the order dated 29.01.2024 passe by the respondent No.3 has not been complied with till date.

3. 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. "

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

the order dated 29.01.2024 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 18, 2026
saqlain