



2026:AHC:45970

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 646 of 2026

Sri Lal

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

The State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Vishal Khandelwal
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: Avinash Chandra Srivastava, C.S.C.

Court No. - 54

HON'BLE DINESH PATHAK, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel representing State-respondents, learned counsel for the Gaon Sabha (respondent No. 4) and perused the record.

2. This writ petition has been filed, inter alia, seeking following reliefs:

"(i) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding the respondent no.2 & 3 to implement the orders dated: 29.03.2006 in case no.268 & order dated: 6.6.1991 in case no. 159 in the revenue records as per the provisions of section 6 (2) of U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1953' and further to issue the copy of fresh khatauni of the disputed land to the petitioner.

(ii) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding the respondent no.2 & 3 to decide the representation dated: 3.10.2025 (Annexure 5&6) submitted by the petitioner before them in the light of the provisions of section 6 (2) of U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1953' and the corrected copy of khatauni may also be issued forthwith."

3. Grievance of the petitioner is that the State authorities are not giving effect to the aforementioned orders under the provisions of law as enunciated under Section 6(2) of U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act.

4. It is submitted that unit/village in question has been de-notified under Section 6(1) of U.P.C.H. Act. Before cancellation of the consolidation operation under Section 6(1) of U.P.C.H. Act, order dated 29.03.2006 and order dated 06.06.1991 passed by the Assistant Consolidation Officer has

attained finality inasmuch as same has not been challenged before any competent court by any party. Therefore, State authorities are under legal obligation to implement the said order in land record in pursuance of the provisions of law as enunciated under Section 6(2) of U.P.C.H. Act.

5. Learned Standing Counsel has contended that the grievance of the petitioner can more appropriately be redressed by the Deputy Director of Consolidation, who may be directed to decide the fresh representation, to be moved by the petitioner showing his grievance, within a stipulated period as fixed by this Court.

6. In this conspectus, as above, no useful purpose would be served by keeping this matter pending. Therefore, this court deems it appropriate to finally dispose of the present writ petition, without considering the merits of the case, with liberty to the petitioner to file a fresh representation before respondent No. 3 (District Deputy Director of Consolidation) with respect to his grievances, as raised in the present writ petition, within a period of two weeks from today, along with a certified copy of this order and a self attested copy of the present writ petition, who shall, either himself or through the authority competent, as required under the law, consider and decide the same in accordance with law expeditiously, preferably, within a period of three months thereafter, if there is no any other legal impediment.

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

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)

February 27, 2026

vinay