



2026:AHC-LKO:3495

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

MATTERS UNDER ARTICLE 227 No. - 7018 of 2025

Surya Narayan

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Board Of Revenue, U.P. Lko. And Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Saryu Prasad Tiwari, Prince Kumar Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C., Mohan Singh

Court No. - 5

HON'BLE ALOK MATHUR, J.

1. Heard Sri Saryu Prasad Tiwari, learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Standing Counsel for respondent nos. 1 and 3.
2. In the light of proposed order notice to private respondent is dispensed with.
3. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that respondent no. 4 had filed an appeal under Section 24(4) of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 before the Commissioner, Ayodhya Division, Ayodhya, which was rejected on 03.01.2025, which order in turn was assailed before the Board of Revenue by filing revision under Section 210 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 by respondent no. 4.
4. It has been submitted that interim order was passed on 04.02.2025 and records were also summoned. It has been submitted that when the proceedings before the Board of Revenue were not concluded expeditiously, consequently, writ petition was filed by the petitioner being Writ Petition No. 4826 of 2025, before this Court which was disposed of by order dated 12.08.2025, giving liberty to the petitioner to file appropriate application before the trial Court within next two weeks for expediting the proceedings.
5. It has been submitted that the Board of Revenue has concluded the hearing and reserved the matter for judgment on 15.09.2025 and which fact is evident from the status of the said case which has been obtained by the petitioner on-line. It has been submitted that even after expiry of four months from the date of reserving the judgment, the judgment has not been pronounced and therefore in the present writ petition prayer has been made for direction to the Board of Revenue to pronounce the judgment in the said case with expedition.

6. The issue pertaining to reserving a judgment and time period consumed for its pronouncement has been subject matter which has been dealt with by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in number of cases. In the case of **Anil Rai Vs. State of Bihar, 2001 (7) SCC 318**, the said issue came to be noticed by the Apex Court which pertains to the matters which were pending before the various High Courts where arguments have been concluded but the judgment has not been pronounced for sufficient length of time and in the aforesaid circumstances, the Apex Court had observed as under :-

“9. It is true, that for the High Courts, no period for pronouncement of judgment is contemplated either under the Civil Procedure Code or the Criminal Procedure Code, but as the pronouncement of the judgment is a part of the justice dispensation system, it has to be without delay. In a country like ours where people consider the Judges only second to God, efforts be made to strengthen that belief of the common man. Delay in disposal of the cases facilitates the people to raise eyebrows, sometimes genuinely which, if not checked, may shake the confidence of the people in the judicial system. A time has come when the judiciary itself has to assert for preserving its stature, respect and regards for the attainment of the rule of law. For the fault of a few, the glorious and glittering name of the judiciary cannot be permitted to be made ugly. It is the policy and purpose of law, to have speedy justice for which efforts are required to be made to come up to the expectation of the society of ensuring speedy, untainted and unpolluted justice.

10. Under the prevalent circumstances in some of the High Courts, I feel it appropriate to provide some guidelines regarding the pronouncement of judgments which, I am sure, shall be followed by all concerned, being the mandate of this Court. Such guidelines, as for the present, are as under:

(i) The Chief Justices of the High Courts may issue appropriate directions to the Registry that in a case where the judgment is reserved and is pronounced later, a column be added in the judgment where, on the first page, after the cause-title, date of reserving the judgment and date of pronouncing it be separately mentioned by the Court Officer concerned.

(ii) That Chief Justices of the High Courts, on their administrative side, should direct the Court Officers/Readers of the various Benches in the High Courts to furnish every month the list of cases in the matters where the judgments reserved are not pronounced within the period of that month.

(iii) On noticing that after conclusion of the arguments the judgment is not pronounced within a period of two months, the Chief Justice concerned shall draw the attention of the Bench concerned to the pending matter. The Chief Justice may also see the desirability of circulating the statement of such cases in which the judgments have not been pronounced within a period of six weeks from the date of conclusion of the arguments amongst the Judges of the High Court for their information. Such communication be conveyed as confidential and in a sealed cover.

(iv) *Where a judgment is not pronounced within three months from the date of reserving it, any of the parties in the case is permitted to file an application in the High Court with a prayer for early judgment. Such application, as and when filed, shall be listed before the Bench concerned within two days excluding the intervening holidays.*

(v) *If the judgment, for any reason, is not pronounced within a period of six months, any of the parties of the said lis shall be entitled to move an application before the Chief Justice of the High Court with a prayer to withdraw the said case and to make it over to any other Bench for fresh arguments. It is open to the Chief Justice to grant the said prayer or to pass any other order as he deems fit in the circumstances.”*

7. This aspect of the matter was again considered by the Apex Court in the case of **Ravindra Pratap Sahi Vs. State of U.P. and Others, Criminal Appeal No. 3700/3701 of 2025** (decided on 25.08.2025), wherein citing the judgment of the Apex Court in the case of **Anil Rai (supra)**, the Apex Court was of the view that judgment should be pronounced within a period of three months. It was further observed that in case the judgments are not pronounced, then within two weeks of the fact been brought to the knowledge of the respective Bench, the matter ought to be assigned to another Bench.

8. This Court see no reason as to why the said pronouncement be also made applicable to the revenue Courts including the Board of Revenue, who are directed to pronounce judgments within a period of three months from the date they are reserved.

9. Accordingly, in view of the arguments of the respective counsels as well as taking into account various directions of the Apex Court, present writ petition is **disposed of** with direction to the petitioner to bring this judgment to the knowledge of the Board of Revenue. In case judgment is not pronounced within two weeks from the date of production of certified copy of this order, the matter shall be assigned to another Bench of the Board of Revenue for being heard and decided in terms of various directions issued by the Apex Court as well as directions issued in the present case.

10. Let a copy of the present judgment be also placed before the Chairman, Board of Revenue, U.P. Lucknow by the office of learned Chief Standing Counsel, forthwith.

(Alok Mathur,J.)

January 16, 2026

A. Verma