



2026:AHC:57123

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 3291 of 2025

Rajveer And Another

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Anil Kumar, Satish Kumar Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: Avinash Chandra Srivastava, C.S.C.

Court No. - 54

HON'BLE DINESH PATHAK, J.

1. Supplementary affidavit filed by the petitioners is taken on record.
2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel and perused the record.
3. The petitioner has invoked the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, *inter alia*, seeking the following prayers:-

"i. Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent authorities to make an entry and correct the recent revenue records in respect of order dated 05.07.2016 passed by Consolidation Officer, Sadar Mainpuri in Case No. 578/2015-16 under Section 9A(2) of the U.P.C.H. Act (Rajveer and others) Vs. State), Mauja Harere, Tehsil Karhal, District- Mainpuri..

ii. Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of mandamus directing the respondent authority to consider and decide the representation dated 19.06.2025 of the petitioner forthwith."

4. The petitioner is aggrieved by the inaction/omission at the part of the District authorities concerned in not giving effect to the order dated 15.10.2019 passed by the Assistant Consolidation Officer in land revenue record in accordance with the provisions of law as enunciated under Section 6(2) of U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act.

5. It is submitted that Consolidation operations in the village Hardauli were cancelled by a notification issued under Section 6(1) of U.P.C.H. Act promulgated on 21.2.2019. Prior to the cancellation of the consolidation operation an order dated 15.10.1990 had been passed by Assistant Consolidation Officer in case No.2451 under Section 12 of U.P.C.H. Act. As per para 9 of the writ petition, the aforesaid order dated 15.10.1990 has attained finality between the parties, inasmuch as same has not been assailed before any court competent. It is, thus, submitted that consolidation authorities are under a legal obligation, in terms of Section 6(2) of U.P.C.H. Act, to implement the order dated 15.10.1990 in land revenue records, which had attained finality prior to the cessation of the consolidation operations by virtue of notification under Section 6(1) of U.P.C.H. Act.

6. Learned Standing Counsel has contended that the grievance of the petitioner can more appropriately be redressed by the Deputy Director of Consolidation, who may be directed to decide a fresh representation, to be moved by the petitioner, ventilating his grievance, within a stipulated period as may be fixed by this Court.

7. In this conspectus, as above, no useful purpose would be served in keeping the present matter pending; therefore, this Court deems it appropriate to finally dispose of the present writ petition, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case as mentioned in the present writ petition, with a direction that the petitioner shall be at liberty to move a fresh representation qua his grievance as averred in the instance writ petition, along with a self attested copy of the instant writ petition and a certified copy

of the order of the date, before the District Deputy Director of Consolidation within a period of two weeks from today, who shall, either himself or through a authority competent, decide the said representation, in accordance with law, expeditiously, preferably within a period of three months from the date of filing of the aforesaid representation, if there is no other legal impediment.

8. With the aforesaid direction, present writ petition is **disposed of**.

March 19, 2026

Neetu

(Dinesh Pathak,J.)