

Court No. - 51

Case :- WRIT - C No. - 39475 of 2023

Petitioner :- Natthu Lal And 12 Others

Respondent :- State Of U.P. And 4 Others

Counsel for Petitioner :- Jai Prakash Singh

Counsel for Respondent :- C.S.C.,Sanjay Rajpoot,Sher Bahadur Singh

Hon'ble Chandra Kumar Rai,J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, Sri Sher Bahadur Singh, learned counsel for the respondent-gaon sabha and Sri Sanjay Rajpoot, learned counsel for the caveator-respondents.

2. The instant writ petition has been filed for mandamus, directing respondent no.3/Sub-Divisional Officer, Tehsil, Bisalpur, District Pilibhit to decide the application/representation dated 22.9.2023, within the stipulated period.

3. Counsel for the petitioners submitted that petitioners were granted lease for 5 years. He submitted that sugarcane crops are standing over the plot in dispute. He also submitted that petitioners have filed an application/representation dated 22.9.2023 with the prayer that period of lease be extended in favour of the petitioners.

4. Sri Abhishek Shukla, learned Addl. C.S.C. for the state-respondents submitted that lease cannot be extended as prayed by the petitioners under his application/representation dated 22.9.2023, as such, the application/representation of the petitioners is misconceived and cannot be entertained.

5. I have considered the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the records.

6. The application/representation dated 22.9.2023 filed by the petitioners before respondent no.3 reveals that petitioners prays for renewal of lease, alleged to be executed in favour of the petitioners. Counsel for the petitioners has failed to demonstrate as to under what provisions of law, the lease can be renewed in favour of the petitioners.

7. No interference is required in respect to the relief claimed in the writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

8. The writ petition is not maintainable and is, accordingly, dismissed.

Order Date :- 17.11.2023

C.Prakash