



2026:AHC-LKO:19761

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - C No. - 2567 of 2026

M/S Shadab Fruit Company Thru. Proprietor
Mohd. Shadad

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Secy. Agricultural Deptt. Govt.
Of U.P. Lko. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Anand Pal Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 19

HON'BLE SYED QAMAR HASAN RIZVI, J.

1. Shri Anand Pal Sinnggh 'Vishen', learned counsel for petitioner, Shri Pankaj Srivastava, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State/respondent no. 1 and Shri Rajesh Kumar, learned counsel for Rajya Krishi Utpadan Mandi Parishad/respondent nos. 2 and 3 are present.

2. By means of the present writ petition, the petitioner has challenged the order dated 12.02.2026 passed by the Director, Rajya Krishi Utpadan Mandi Parishad, U.P. Lucknow (respondent no. 2) and the order dated 5/9.05.2025 passed by the Secretary, Krishi Utpadan Mandi Samiti, Meerut.

3. The submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner has deposited a total sum of Rs. 18,08,000/- on various dates between 05.05.2018 and 05.05.2025. However, the petitioner could not deposit the premium amount within the stipulated time due to the failure of the Mandi Samiti to issue a licence for the shop allotted to the petitioner, the non-commencement of business operations since the date of allotment, and the fact that the shop is situated in a backyard area where no commercial activity is presently being carried out.

4. It is very categorically stated by learned counsel for petitioner that the petitioner intends to deposit the remaining amount but it is due to inaction on the part of the opposite parties that the petitioner has not been able to

deposit the same.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner challenged the order dated 5/9.05.2025 passed by Secretary, Krishi Utpadan Mandi Samiti (respondent no. 3) having Revision No. 22 of 2025 raising specific grounds but the Director, Rajya Krishi Utpadan Mandi Parishad, U.P. Lucknow (respondent no. 2) rejected the same without taking into consideration the grounds raised by the petitioner in the revision.

6. Learned counsel for petitioner has stated that the revisional authority in an identical set of facts has allowed the revision bearing Revision No. 12 of 2025 (Surendra Vs. Secretary, Krishi Utpadan Mandi Samiti)

6. Shri Rajesh Kumar, learned counsel for respondent nos. 2 and 3 has vehemently opposed the petition and has stated that despite due opportunity of hearing to the petitioner to deposit the balance amount, it failed to deposit the same and as such, the impugned orders were passed strictly in accordance with law. Further submission is that there is no discrepancy or illegality in the impugned orders and prayed for dismissal of the writ petition.

7. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.

8. Taking into consideration the factual matrix of the case and the orders impugned in the writ petition, this Court is of the considered opinion that the grounds taken by the petitioner in the revision has not been duly considered by the Director, Rajya Krishi Utpadan Mandi Parishad, U.P. Lucknow (respondent no. 2) while passing the impugned order dated 12.02.2026.

9. Accordingly, the impugned order dated 12.02.2026 passed by the Director, Rajya Krishi Utpadan Mandi Parishad, U.P. Lucknow (respondent no. 2) is set aside and the matter is remitted to the revisional authority i.e. Commissioner/Director, Rajya Krishi Utpadan Mandi Parishad, U.P. Lucknow (respondent no. 2) to expeditiously decide the revision a fresh after affording due opportunity of hearing to the petitioner

and by taking into consideration the grounds and all the pleas raised by the petitioner in the revision strictly in accordance with law.

10. With the aforesaid observations/directions, this petition stands ***allowed.***

(Syed Qamar Hasan Rizvi,J.)

March 18, 2026
Virendra