



2026:AHC:37494

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 2984 of 2026

Phullo

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Ruduvant Pratap Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Kaushal Kishore Mani

Court No. - 6

HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.

1. In the resolution passed by the Land Management Committee dated 24.10.1975, a land was allotted in favour of the petitioner without assigning any reasons and without providing any opportunity of hearing.

2. The aforesaid allotment was cancelled by the Sub Divisional Officer, Rampur, Maniharan, District Saharanpur/ Respondent No.3 vide order dated 15.01.2007. Order reads as follows:-

“तहसील आख्या से सहमत होते हुए प्रश्नगत भूमि को उसकी पूर्व नोययत में दर्ज करने के आदेश पारित किये जाते हैं। तदनुसार अभिलेखों में संशोधन हेतु पत्रावली तहसीलदार देवबन्द को भेजी जाये।”

3. When the petitioner came to know regarding the aforesaid order, he immediately filed a Revision as provided under Section 210 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 along-with an application for condonation of delay. The same was rejected by the Respondent No.2 vide order dated 01.08.2025, hence the present writ petition.

4. It is stated in paragraph-10 of the writ petition that the lease be granted in favour of the petitioner by way of agricultural patta, hence the same could not be cancelled by the Respondent No.3 without assigning any reasons and without affording opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

5. In the order of Revision, a findings has been recorded that the petitioner was allotted an asami patta which was valid only for a period of 5 years. Assuming that this fact is correct even then before cancellation of patta which was granted in favour of the petitioner, the respondent no.3 has passed an order without providing an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

6. In this view of the matter, the Court is of the prima facie opinion that order passed by the Respondent No.3 dated 15.01.2007 as well as consequential order dated 01.08.2025 passed by the Respondent No.2 are perse illegal and in violation of principles of natural justice. Hence the same are liable to be set aside and are hereby quashed.

7. In view of above, the writ petition is **allowed**. No order as to costs.

8. However this order will not be restrained the Respondent No.3 namely Sub Divisional Officer, Rampur Maniharan, District Saharanpur to initiate the fresh proceedings against the petitioner.

(Prakash Padia,J.)

February 19, 2026

Swati