

Court No. - 48

Case :- WRIT - B No. - 3922 of 2023

Petitioner :- Jitendra

Respondent :- State Of U.P. And 5 Others

Counsel for Petitioner :- Indresh Kumar

Counsel for Respondent :- C.S.C., Pankaj Kumar Gupta

Hon'ble Saurabh Shyam Shamshery, J.

1. Heard Sri Indresh Kumar, learned counsel for petitioner and Sri Pankaj Kumar Gupta, Advocate for Gaon Sabha.
2. Petitioner is aggrieved that proposed chak marg which is going through his land would cause inconvenience and hardship to him as well as that spot inspection report was not correct and specific contention raised in this regard has not been considered by all the three authorities under U.P. Consolidation of Holdings Act, 1953.
3. Learned counsel appearing for Gaon Sabha has supported the impugned order.
4. I have carefully perused the impugned order which is based on spot inspection. A vague assertion has been made that spot inspection is not correct, which cannot be accepted since there is no material to support it.
5. Preparation of chak marg during consolidation proceedings is specifically provided under the Act itself and it is proposed for convenience of public at large. Even there is certain inconvenience caused to petitioner, it would not be sufficient since proposed chak marg is for benefit of public at large.
6. As observed above, petitioner has not been able to show any great inconvenience caused to him and since the order impugned is passed on the basis of spot inspection, which is not contradicted, therefore, I do not find any reason to interfere.
7. Writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

Order Date :- 28.11.2023

AK