



2026:AHC:26399

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 351 of 2026

Smt. Geeta Devi

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Board Of Revenue U.P. And 15 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Abhay Raj Yadav
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Achal Singh, C.S.C.

Court No. - 55

HON'BLE CHANDRA KUMAR RAI, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Hari Mohan Srivastava, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State-respondents and Mr. Achal Singh, learned counsel for the respondent- Land Management Committee.

2. The instant petition has been filed for the following reliefs:

"i. issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari to quash the impugned order dated 31.12.2025 passed by respondent no.1 in revision no.4786 of 2025.

ii. issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents not to interfere in the peaceful possession of the petitioner over the land in dispute."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that in appeal filed against the order of trial Court in the proceeding under Section 116 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006, matter has been remanded back before the trial Court to prepare the kurra afresh considering the claim of petitioner in respect to the plot no. 70 in accordance with law. He further submitted that against the remand order revision was filed by the private respondent with delay and Board of Revenue has condoned the delay as well as granted interim protection without affording proper opportunity of hearing to petitioner. He further submitted that the order passed by the Board of Revenue should be set aside and Board of Revenue be directed to decide the delay condonation matter as well as application for interim

relief afresh after affording opportunity of hearing to the parties.

4. Learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State and learned counsel for the Land Management Committee submitted that no interference is required against the order impugned passed by the Board of Revenue during pendency of the revision. They further submitted that the Board of Revenue has condoned the delay which is not inordinate and cost of Rs.500/- has been awarded. They further submitted that the Board of Revenue has recorded reason in support of the order, as such, no interference is required against the impugned order.

5. I have considered the argument advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State, learned counsel for the Land Management Committee and perused the records.

6. There is no dispute about the fact that revision filed by private respondent is pending before the Board of Revenue / respondent no.1. There is also no dispute about the fact that delay in filing the revision has been condoned and interim order has been granted.

7. Perusal of the record demonstrate that there is no inordinate delay in filing the revision and delay has been condoned on cost of Rs.500/-, as such, interest of justice requires that pending revision should be decided in accordance with law after affording proper opportunity of hearing to both parties.

8. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, the instant writ petition is finally ***disposed of*** directing the respondent no.1/ Board of Revenue, U.P. at Prayagraj to decide the aforementioned Revision No. 4786 of 2025, under Section 210 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 in accordance with law after affording proper opportunity of hearing to the parties, expeditiously preferably within a period of two months from the date of production of certified copy of this order.

(Chandra Kumar Rai,J.)

February 6, 2026

Rameez