



2026:AHC:50787

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 728 of 2026

Suresh And 2 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Akhilesh Pandey, Manoj Kumar
Gautam
Counsel for Respondent(s) : C.S.C.

Court No. - 55

HON'BLE CHANDRA KUMAR RAI, J.

1. Supplementary affidavit filed today is taken on record.
2. Heard Mr. Manoj Kumar Gautam, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. R.C. Srivastava, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State-respondents.
3. The instant writ petition has been filed for the following relief:

"a. to issue a writ, order or direction, directing to the respondents to issue a direction to respondent no. 2 to decide the delete application no. Nil of 2025, Fakeer chand and others Versus Madan and others, District Moradabad, pending under Section Order 1, Rules 10 (2) Civil Procedure Code expeditiously."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that revision filed by the father of the petitioner No.1 along with petitioner Nos.2 and 3 is pending before board of revenue since 2000-01. He further submitted that in revision Madan, Mahendra, Hargovind, Ghan Shyam and State of U.P were impleaded as opposite parties. He further submitted that during pendency of the aforementioned revision, an application for deletion of name of opposite party No.4- Ghan Shyam from the array of the parties has been filed on 8.9.2025 on the ground that power of attorney executed in favour of Ghan Shyam has been cancelled on 20.3.2010. He submitted

that aforementioned application dated 8.9.2025 is still pending before board of revenue in the aforementioned revision as such board of revenue be directed to decide the deletion application dated 8.9.2025 within time bound period.

4. Mr. R.C. Srivastava, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State-respondents submitted that deletion application has not been registered, as such no direction can be issued for disposal of the same. He further submitted that revision filed by petitioners is pending for last 25 years, as such no direction can be issued for expeditious disposal of pending revision in accordance with law.

5. I have considered the arguments advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State and perused the record.

6. There is no dispute about the fact that revision filed by the petitioners is pending before respondent no.2-board of revenue since 2000-01

7. Interest of justice requires that pending proceedings should be decided expeditiously.

8. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, the instant writ petition is finally disposed of directing the respondent no.2-board of revenue to decide the aforementioned revision in accordance with law, after affording proper opportunity of hearing to the parties expeditiously preferably within a period of two months from the date of production of certified copy of this order before him. It is further direction that all the pending application in the revision shall be disposed of by the board of revenue in accordance with law.

March 12, 2026

PS*

(Chandra Kumar Rai,J.)