



2026:AHC:35074

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 670 of 2026

Rampal Garg

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 5 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Raj Kishor Pandey, Satya Prakash Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: Achal Singh, C.S.C.

Court No. - 55

HON'BLE CHANDRA KUMAR RAI, J.

1.Heard Mr. Satya Prakash Pandey, 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 respondent No.3-Gram Sabha.

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

" (i) To call for the records and to issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the Hon'ble Board of Revenue to consider and pass order on the stay application dated 30.10.2025 filed by the petitioners in Reference No.287 of 1974-75 (Bhagirath Vs. Gaon Sabha) at the earliest in stipulated time.

(ii) To issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus restraining the respondents from dispossessing the petitioners and alienating and changing the nature of the land in dispute which is plot No.310 situated in Mauza Gudhakala, Tehsil Naraini, District Banda."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the aforementioned proceeding is pending before respondent No.2-Board of Revenue U.P. Prayagraj since 1976. He submitted that interim protection is required in the matter accordingly application for interim relief has been filed before Board of Revenue on 30.10.2025. He submitted that proper direction be issued for expeditious disposal of application for interim relief and till the

pendency of the proceeding before Board of Revenue, interim protection be granted in favour of the petitioner restraining the respondents from dispossessing the petitioner and alienating as well as changing the nature of the plot in question.

4. I have considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the record.

5. There is no dispute about the fact that proceeding for reference is pending before Board of Revenue since 1976.

6. Since the matter is pending before Board of Revenue, U.P. Prayagraj for last more than 50 years, as such the same should be decided very expeditiously.

7. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the issue, the present petition stands **disposed of** finally directing respondent No.2-Board of Revenue U.P. Prayagraj to decide the aforementioned ***Reference No.287 of 1974-75*** in accordance with law expeditiously and preferably within a period of **four weeks** from the date of production of certified copy of this order after giving opportunity of hearing to both the parties. It is further directed that before deciding the aforementioned case, all the pending applications in the proceeding shall be decided by Board of Revenue in accordance with law.

(Chandra Kumar Rai,J.)

February 17, 2026

PS*