



2026:AHC:35992

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 4319 of 2026

Prabhakant

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 15 Other

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Jitendra Pratap Gautam
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Azad Rai, C.S.C.

Court No. - 6

HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record.
2. The petitioner has preferred present writ petition inter-alia with the following prayers :-

"i) Issue an appropriate direction, directing the respondent no.2, the Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Soraon, Tehsil Soraon, District Prayagraj, to expeditiously decide the stay application and adjudicate Case No. NIL of 2025, Ramesh Chandra vs. Ghandhyam and Others, filed by respondent no.4, Ramesh Chandra, under Section 116 of the Uttar Pradesh Revenue Code, 2006, on 04.12.2025, pertaining to Khata No. 00248, Gata No. 388, measuring 0.1830 hectare, situated in Village Madhopur alias Sadhanganj, Pargana and Tehsil Soraon, District Prayagraj.

ii) Issue an appropriate writ, order, or direction commanding the respondents of the Ilnd set to maintain status quo with respect to the land in question, bearing Khata No. 00248, Gata No. 388, measuring 0.1830 hectare, situated in Village Madhopur alias Sadhanganj, Pargana and Tehsil Soraon, District Prayagraj; and further restrain respondent no.4, Ramesh Chandra (plaintiff), from dispossessing the Petitioner therefrom, or from changing the nature of the said land, or raising any construction thereon, until the final disposal of the stay application as well as the said case, pending before respondent no.2, Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Soraon, Tehsil Soraon, District Prayagraj."

3. In view of the order proposed to be passed herein, no useful purpose would be served by putting the respondent/respondents to notice and keeping this petition pending before this Court. However, in case

respondent/respondents feels aggrieved by the order his/her right to seek modification/variation of the order is being kept reserved.

4. From perusal of the record it transpires that nothing has been stated in the entire petition that there is any extraordinary situation nor any arguments have been made in this regard by the learned counsel for the petitioner to direct the court below to decide the aforesaid case in a time bound manner except the fact that case is filed in the year 2025.

5. In view of the above, no relief could be granted to the petitioner. However, court below is expected to decide the aforesaid case *strictly in accordance with law* without granting any unnecessary adjournment to either of the parties unless there is no legal impediment.

6. With the aforesaid observations, the petition is disposed of.

(Prakash Padia,J.)

February 18, 2026
Pramod Tripathi