



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 412 of 2026

Man Mohan Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 6 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Neelabh Srivastava, Shailesh Kumar Yadav
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Sudhir Bharti

Court No. - 55

HON'BLE CHANDRA KUMAR RAI, J.

1. Heard Sri Neelabh Srivastava, learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri Satendra Bhushan Dubey, learned standing counsel for the state-respondents and Sri Sudhir Bharti, learned counsel for the respondent-gaon sabha.
2. Instruction dated 17.2.2026, sent by the Tehsildar, Sadar, Deoria has been placed before the Court which is taken on record.
3. Learned standing counsel, on the basis of the instruction, submitted that revenue team constituted for inspection of the plot in question, has submitted a report to the effect that *Panchayat Bhawan* has been constructed over the part of the area of plot no.300M, which is recorded as *bhitta* and the remaining area is free from encroachment. He further submitted that over the part of the area of plot no.300M, Hanuman Mandir and Shiv Mandir are existing. He also submitted that there is no encroachment over plot no.333M which is recorded as *pokhari* except the part of the area which is in use of the villagers of the village in question as passage.
4. Counsel for the petitioner is disputing the facts mentioned in the instruction.
5. Learned counsel for the State shall serve a copy of the instruction upon the counsel for the petitioner, during the course of the day.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner shall file reply to the facts mentioned in the instruction within 2 weeks as well as annex the complete copy of the *khatauni* of all the plots of current fasli year.

7. Put up this matter as fresh on 17.3.2026.

(Chandra Kumar Rai,J.)

February 23, 2026

C.Prakash