



2026:AHC:23744

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 437 of 2026

Mahesh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Suresh Yadav
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 54

HON'BLE DINESH PATHAK, J.

1. This writ petition has been filed, inter alia, seeking the following relief:

"i) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondent no. 3 (District Deputy Director of Consolidation, District Banda) to decide the representation dated 30-07-2025 submitted by the petitioner in accordance with law and implement the order dated 02.08.2004 passed in Case no. 392 and with regard to Khata No. 82 II of Village Garagpur, Pargana and Tehsil Atarra, District Banda in view of Section 6(2) of the Consolidation of Holdings Act during the pendency of this writ petition in the interest of justice."

2. Grievance of the petitioner is that the State authorities are not giving effect to the order dated 02.08.2004 passed by Assistant Consolidation Officer under the provisions of law as enunciated under Section 6(2) of U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act.

3. 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 02.08.2004 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.

4. 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.

5. In this conspectus, as above, no useful purpose would be served to keep 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 District Deputy Director of Consolidation (respondent no.3) with respect to his grievances, as mentioned in the present writ petition, within a period of two weeks from today along with a certified copy of this order and 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.

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

February 4, 2026

vkg

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)