



2026:AHC-LKO:21119

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - B No. - 168 of 2026

Bhanu Pratap Verma

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Deputy Director Of Consolidation, Bahraich And
Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Rajeiu Kumar Tripathi
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C., Mohd. Parvez Iqbal, Mohd. Tabrez Iqbal, Piyush Kishor, Shashwat Srivastava, Uma Shankar Sahai

Court No. - 6

HON'BLE PANKAJ BHATIA, J.

1. Affidavit of service filed by the learned counsel for the petitioner and vakalatnama filed by Sri Uma Shankar Sahai, Advocate on behalf of the respondent nos. 2 to 10, are taken on record.
2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondent nos. 2 to 10.
3. The contention raised by the learned counsel for the parties was recorded by this Court in its order dated 12.03.2026, which is being reproduced herein below:-

"Heard learned counsel for the petitioner. Notice on behalf of respondent no. 1 has been accepted by the office of the learned Chief Standing Counsel. Sri U.S. Sahai, learned counsel has accepted notice on behalf of respondent no. 2 who has filed the preliminary objections which are taken on record.

The matter involved in the instant petition is a short question. In all 6 revisions are pending adjudication before the Deputy Director of Consolidation, Bahraich. As per the petitioner, the matter relates to the same plot in between the same parties, however, on a request earlier, all revisions were transferred before the Deputy Director of Consolidation, Bahraich, however, later another revision which has also been transferred to the Deputy Director of Consolidation, Bahraich but the same has not been consolidation, as a result, an application was moved by the petitioner that all the 6 revisions be heard together. The application for consolidation has been rejected.

Being aggrieved, the petitioner has approached this Court with the only prayer that all the 6 revisions may be heard together.

Sri U.S. Sahai, learned counsel for the respondent no. 2 has raised an apprehension that the revision has been preferred with a delay of about 3 decades.

It is urged that the attempt of the petitioner appears to be to get the revisions decided on merits rather than consideration on the issue of delay which needs to be decided first.

Be that as it may, it will be necessary to hear the private respondent nos. 3 to 10 also.

Accordingly, let the notice be issued to the respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioner shall be at liberty of serving the private respondents nos. 3 to 10 by Dasti summons through the counsel appearing before the Deputy Director of Consolidation at Bahraich. Necessary process shall be taken by the learned counsel for the petitioner by tomorrow i.e. 13.03.2026.

List this matter on 24th March, 2026, as fresh on which date the learned counsel for the petitioner shall file an affidavit of service."

4. In light of the aforesaid, the submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that all the six revisions, including the revision filed against the order dated 07.04.1983, may be heard simultaneously, as the land in question is common to all the revisions.

5. Sri U.S. Sahai, learned counsel for the respondent, opposes the said prayer on the ground that sixth revision filed by the petitioner bearing Revision No. 20 of 2020, is a defective revision, as the same has been filed along with a delay condonation application seeking condonation of delay of almost 37 years, as such, the same cannot be consolidated. However, there is not disagreement between the parties that the land in question is similar in respect of all the revisions, which are pending and are to be decided.

6. Considering the submissions made at the Bar, I deem it appropriate to direct that the revisional authority shall pass an order on the delay condonation application filed in Revision No. 20 of 2020 within a period of two weeks, without granting any unnecessary adjournment to either of the parties, in accordance with law.

7. In the event, the delay is condoned, all the revisions shall be heard simultaneously and shall be decided together. In the event, the delay

condonation application is rejected, the remaining five revisions shall be decided separately, expeditiously and preferably within a period of four months. In the event of rejection of the delay condonation application, the petitioner shall be entitled to avail such remedies as may be available to him under law.

8. The present petition is ***disposed of*** in terms of the aforesaid directions.

(Pankaj Bhatia,J.)

March 24, 2026

Preeti