



2026:AHC:47856

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 8541 of 2026

Prem Chand

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 17 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Rakesh Kumar Verma

Counsel for Respondent(s) : C.S.C., Rameshwar Prasad Shukla

Court No. - 6

HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel for the respondent-State, Sri R. P. Shukla, learned counsel for the respondent no.3 and perused the records.

2. The petitioner has preferred present writ petition inter-alia with the following prayer :-

"A. Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of writ of Mandamus directing and commanding the respondent no.2 to comply with the order dated 18.07.2023 as well as order dated 03.02.2026 as passed by respondent no.2 in Case No.688/2023, Computerised Case No.T202315090200688 (Prem Chand Versus L.M.C., Bahadura and others) under section 24 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 and in Case No.8819 of 2025, Computerized Case No.T202515090208819 (Subhash Versus Prem Chand and others) under section 209-Ja of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006."

3. It is argued by counsel for the petitioner that respondent no.2-Sub Divisional Magistrate, Tehsil-Sikandarpur, District Ballia has passed the orders dated 18.07.2023 and 03.02.2026 but the same has not been complied with.

4. Coordinate Bench of this Court in bunch of writ petitions being leading **Writ C No.35470 of 2025 (Meena Devi vs. State of U.P. and 5 others)** decided on 18.12.2025, certain directions were given in paragraph nos.44 to 46 which reads as follows:-

"44. Section 24 of the UP Revenue Code, 2006 vests the SDO with statutory quasi-judicial powers for summary settlement of boundary disputes coupled with mandatory enforcement authority for demarcation and possession restoration. Execution is not discretionary but integral to the provision's efficacy—failure to enforce renders the entire summary mechanism otiose and defeats the legislative intent. The broad guidelines formulated aim at providing for a structured framework harmonizing statutory mandates (Section 24 of Code, 2006; Rule 22 of Rules, 2016), executive instructions (Government Order dated 16.12.2025), administrative law principles, and constitutional imperatives of fairness and public order. The concerned respondents, in particular the SDO and Collector, are under law bound to ensure that orders under Section 24 are effectively enforced.

45. The Secretary, Department of Revenue, State of Uttar Pradesh, shall ensure statewide circulation of aforesaid guidelines to all revenue authorities within the State. A mechanism for providing mandatory training and RCCMS protocol compliance may also be ensured.

46. The respondents, particularly the concerned SDOs are directed forthwith to execute all subject orders in the instant batch of writ petition, within four weeks from the date of production of a certified copy of this order, strictly as per approved site memo/demarcation report, by ensuring affixation of boundary marks and also possession restoration, wherever required. "

5. In this view of the matter, present writ petition is disposed of finally directing the Respondent No.2 to comply with the orders dated 18.07.2023 and 03.02.2026, strictly in accordance with law as well as observations made in the case of **Meena Devi (Supra)** as quoted above.

(Prakash Padia,J.)

March 9, 2026
Pramod Tripathi