



2026:AHC:4790

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 2563 of 2025

Rajiv Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Saurabh Kumar Pandey	
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Anoop Kumar Dubey,	C.S.C.,
		Rameshwar Prasad Shukla	

Court No. - 55

HON'BLE CHANDRA KUMAR RAI, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri M.N. Mishra, learned Addl. C.S.C. for the state-respondents, Sri Rameshwar Prasad Shukla, learned counsel for the respondent-gaon sabha and Mr. Anoop Kumar Dubey learned Counsel for the respondent no. 4.

2. The instant public interest litigation has been filed for the following reliefs:-

"I. Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of mandamus, commanding and directing the respondents authorities, particularly respondent no. 3 Assistant Collector/Tehsildar, Tehsil Lalganj District- Azamgarh, to remove the illegal construction/encroachment caused by private respondent over plot no. 501, area 0.281 hectare recorded as Banjar in the revenue record of Village-Bahloipur, Pargana Devgaon Tehsil-Lalganj, District Azamgarh, within a reasoned and stipulated period as fixed by this Hon'ble Court.

II. Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding directing the respondent authorities particularly the respondent no.2, Tehsildar Tehsil Lalganj District Azamgarh, to decide Case no. 2003/2023 Computerize case no. T202315060402003 (State Vs. Mahendra) Under Section 67 of U.P. Revenue Code 2006, with in a reasoned and stipulated period as fixed by this Hon'ble Court."

3. Counsel for the petitioner submitted that after filing of the instant public interest litigation, proceeding under Section 67 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 has been decided by the Tehsildar vide order dated 11.9.2025.

4. Sri M.N. Misra, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel also placed the order dated 11.9.2025 passed by Tehsildar under section- 67 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 dropping the proceeding against the private respondent no.4.

5. Considering the fact that proceeding under Section 67 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 has been decided, holding that private respondent no. 4 is not in illegal possession of the plot in question as such no interference is required in this matter.

6. The public interest litigation is dismissed accordingly.

(Chandra Kumar Rai,J.)

January 8, 2026

C.Prakash