



2026:AHC:48077

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 963 of 2026

Ram Kumar And 6 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Board Of Revenue U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Deepak Singh, Harish Chandra Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Achal Singh, C.S.C.

Court No. - 55

HON'BLE CHANDRA KUMAR RAI, J.

1. Heard Sri Harish Chandra Singh, learned counsel for the petitioners, Sri Hari Mohan Srivastava, learned Addl. C.S.C. for the state-respondents and Sri Achal Singh, learned counsel for the respondent-gaon sabha.

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

"A. To issue writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus, directing the Respondent No. 1 to decide the stay application of the petitioner dated 29.09.2025, pending in Revision No. 70 of 2008-2009, Computerized Case No.AL2008071991085, Ram Kumar and others Versus Commissioner Chitrakoot Dham Mandal Banda and others and till the decision of the Stay application, respondents authorities be restrained not to take any action against the petitioners in pursuance of the notice dated 27.08.2025 issued by the Area Lekhpal concern by which he has directed to the petitioner to remove their construction over the land in question i.e. Gata No.581 having an area 0.455 hectare situate in Village-Ranipur Bhatt, Tehsil-Karwi, District-Chitrakoot.

(b) To issue a writ order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the Private Respondents not to interfere in the peaceful possession of the petitioner."

3. Counsel for the petitioners states that suit under Section 229-B of

the U.P. Z.A. & L.R. Act filed by the predecessor of petitioners, was dismissed by the trial court in illegal and arbitrary manner. He submitted that 1st appeal filed by the petitioners was also dismissed on the ground of limitation. He submitted that revision filed on behalf of the petitioners in the year 2008-09, was admitted by the Board of Revenue on 14.2.2017 and interim order was granted. He submitted that the aforementioned revision was subsequently dismissed in default on 18.1.2025. He submitted that on restoration application, revision has been restored but no fresh interim order has been granted. He submitted that appropriate direction be issued for the expeditious disposal of the revision and till the disposal of the revision, interim protection be granted in favour of the petitioners.

4. Considering the fact that revision was filed in the year 2008-09 against the order passed in the proceeding under Section 229-B of the U.P. Z.A. & L.R. Act, the pending revision should be decided expeditiously, in accordance with law.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, this petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent no.1/Board of Revenue, U.P. Prayagraj to decide the aforesaid revision, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of 2 months, from the date of production of a certified copy of this order before the authority concerned, after affording proper opportunity of hearing to the parties concerned, in accordance with law.

(Chandra Kumar Rai,J.)

March 10, 2026

C.Prakash