



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 33569 of 2025

Smt. Anju Devi

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Alok Singh, Ramendra Pratap Singh, Vijaypal Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C., Komal Mehrotra, Suresh Singh

Court No. - 29

**HON'BLE MAHESH CHANDRA TRIPATHI, J.
HON'BLE KUNAL RAVI SINGH, J.**

1. Heard Shri Ramendra Pratap Singh, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Shri Alok Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, Shri Fuzail Ahmad Ansari, learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondents, Shri Suresh Singh, learned Senior Panel Counsel for the Yamuna Expressway Industrial Development Authority (YEIDA) and Shri Komal Mehrotra, learned counsel for respondent no. 5 – Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd.

2. This writ petition has been filed praying inter alia for the following relief

"(a). Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari to quashing the order dated 24.02.2021, passed by the respondent no. 3, i.e. Yamuna Expressway Industrial Authority (Annexure no.-11 to this writ petition).

(b) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the Respondent no. 3 to grant temporary permission for allotment of outlet setting up petroleum retail outlet for a period of five years."

3. Shri Ramendra Pratap Singh, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Shri Alok Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner is fully eligible and qualified for the Rural Outlet Dealership as advertised

on 25.11.2018. She duly submitted her online application, which was accepted, and she was subsequently selected through a draw of lots. The petitioner's application was processed, and a Letter of Intent (LOI) was issued by respondent no. 5 – BPCL, in her favour, for a proposed Rural Outlet Dealership at Location No. 249, Dankaur (Dehat) on Dankaur–Sikandrabad Road, District Gautam Buddh Nagar. Learned Senior Advocate submits that the petitioner holds subsisting lease rights for 30 years over the land in question and fulfills all requirements for setting up the said Rural Outlet Dealership. However, in an arbitrary manner, and in disregard of the observations made by the Division Bench in order dated 12.01.2021 passed in Writ-C No. 175 of 2021 (Anju Devi vs. State of U.P. and 3 others), the respondents have rejected the petitioner's claim.

4. Shri Suresh Singh, learned Senior Panel Counsel for YEIDA, submits that as per the Master Plan duly approved by the State Government, no development can take place contrary to the said Master Plan. He further submits that the designated site for the petrol pump is different from the one proposed by the petitioner, and no swapping of land is permissible under the U.P. Urban Planning and Development Act, 1973 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act, 1973"). He further submits that the petitioner still has an efficacious statutory remedy of filing a revision under Section 41 of the Act, 1973.

5. Matter requires consideration.

6. All the respondents are accorded three weeks' time to file response/objection. Petitioner shall have a week thereafter to file rejoinder affidavit.

7. List this case in top ten cases on 11.12.2025.

(Kunal Ravi Singh,J.) (Mahesh Chandra Tripathi,J.)

November 6, 2025

NLY