

Neutral Citation No. - 2024:AHC-LKO:7417

Court No. - 6

Case :- WRIT - C No. - 1004613 of 2003

Petitioner :- Virendra Kumar Shukla And Others

Respondent :- State Of U.P. Through Its Secretary Revenue Department Andors.

Counsel for Petitioner :- V.V.Tripathi,Alpana Yadav,Dr. Aniruddha Kumar Singh,Illegible,Pankaj Kr.Srivastava,Raj Mani Dubey,Sukha Ram Shukla

Counsel for Respondent :- C.S.C.,Ananttika Singh,H.S. Tiwari,Pankaj Khare,S.P.Shukla,Sarvesh Kumar Dubey

Hon'ble Alok Mathur,J.

1. Heard Sri S. R. Shukla, learned counsel for the petitioners, Sri Shantanu holding brief of Ms. Ananttika Singh for respondent No.5 and the Standing counsel on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 4.

2. By means of the present writ petition, the petitioners have challenged the auction dated 3.3.2023 held by Sub Divisional Magistrate, Tehsil Dalmau, Raebareli on account of recovery of agricultural loan taken by late Sri Ram Shankar Shukla, the father of the petitioner No.s 1 to 5 and husband of petitioner No.6.

3. It has been submitted that late Ram Shankar Shukla had taken loan of Rs.31100/- in the year 1990-91 for agricultural purpose but could not repay the said loan installments within the prescribed time. He had taken further loan of Rs.32,000/- from Kshetriya Gramin Bank Ltd. Branch Ghurwara, District Raebareli i.e. opposite party No.6 and another loan of Rs.40,000/- from Uttar Pradesh Sahkari Gramya Vikas Bank, Branch Dalmau, District Raebareli and for the aforesaid loans he had mortgages his agricultural lands of gata No.s 433-KHa/0.115, 601-Ka/0.076, 611/1.00 and 925/0.526 hectares totaling to 1.717 hectares situated in Village Ranjitpur Lonari, Post Kathgar, Tehsil Dalmau, District Raebareli. Sri Ram Shankar Shukla died leaving behind his five sons and his widow who are the petitioners in the present writ petition. In the meantime, the respondent-bank initiated the recovery proceedings against the borrower and a recovery citation was

also issued on 15.4.2002.

4. A writ petition bearing writ petition No.763 (M/S) of 2003 was filed before this Court which was disposed of by means of order dated 12.3.2003 directing petitioner No.1 to deposit a sum of Rs.20,000/- within a month and rest in three equal installments. It is not disputed that the petitioner No.1 could not comply with the said order of the Court and could not repay the amount as directed by the Court. It is in aforesaid circumstances that the mortgaged agricultural land was put to auction. The said auction was carried out and as no borrower had come forward to purchase the said property, the State had purchased the said property for Re.1/- and the auction was also confirmed by the order of the competent authority on 3.3.2003. It is after confirmation of the auction that the present writ petition was filed assailing the said auction.

5. In the counter affidavit filed by the state it has been stated that recovery certificate dated 7.2.2002 was issued for an amount of ₹ 64,844/- by Khadi Gramoudyog, Rai Bareilly against the father of the petitioners. The recovery certificate was issued upon the defaulters personally, but they did not repay the said amount. Subsequently the land measuring area of 1.717 hectares was attached and several dates were fixed for the auction but the same could not be conducted.

6. It has further been stated that in the meanwhile the defaulter Sri Ram Shankar expired and his legal representatives despite being informed to repay the outstanding amount of loan did not repay and also did not participate in the auction proceedings conducted on 18/01/2003. On the said date no one appeared to participate in the said auction and hence the auction was done in favour of the State Government. The Sub Divisional Magistrate, Dalmau confirmed the auction in favour of the State Government.

7. During pendency of the aforesaid petition an affidavit was filed on behalf of the petitioners stating that they have deposited the total remaining amount of the outstanding loan to the respondent-bank and the respondent-bank, on the other hand, has given no dues certificate to the petitioner on 26.11.2019. No dues certificate has been issued by District Gramodyog Adhikari, Raebareli stating that the petitioner has re-paid a total amount of Rs.89,363/- towards all the outstanding loan taken by late Ram Shankar Shukla and no further outstanding remains on account of the said loan. In the application the petitioner has submitted that now that all the amount of loan has been re-paid and the land is still in possession of the

respondents the mortgaged land ought to be released in favour of the petitioners as they have redeemed the loan taken by late Ram Shankar Shukla.

8. To verify the fact as to whether firstly the petitioners have repaid the total loan and secondly as to whether the land is still in possession of the respondents, instructions were sought from Sri Shantanu, learned counsel appearing for the respondents, who has informed this Court, on the basis of written instructions received from Uttar Pradesh Khadi and Gramodyog Board (Legal Cell), Lucknow, confirming firstly that the petitioners have repaid the outstanding loan amount and secondly that no dues certificate has been issued in this regard and also that the officials made inquiries with regard to the status of the mortgaged land in which it has been found that gata No.s 433 Kha/0.1150 hectare, 601 Ka/0.0760 hectare, 611/1.000 hectare and 925/0.5260 hectare have now been mutated in favour of the State and possession of the said land still vests with the petitioners. The said written instructions are taken on record.

9. During the pendency of the writ petition an affidavit was filed stating that the petitioner had deposited ₹ 31,100/- on 22/10/2019 and 21,900/- on 23/10/2019, and accordingly requested the respondent to give him a no due certificate. On the deposit of the aforesaid amount the District Gramoudyog Officer vide letter dated 26/11/2019 issued a no due certificate stating that nothing remains due against the petitioners and recommended that his mortgaged deed be returned back.

10. The aforesaid facts have also not been disputed by the respondents and it has been confirmed by the Standing Counsel, who has informed this Court, on the basis of the written instructions received from the Sub Divisional Magistrate, Dalmau, that though the land has been mutated in the name of the State, but the petitioner and other legal heirs continue to be in possession of the same.

11. In the aforesaid circumstances, the petitioner has prayed that the auction proceedings dated 16/01/2003 be set aside along with the confirmation of the said auction and the respondents be directed to mutate the name of the legal heirs of the borrower in the revenue records and also be enjoined from interfering in the possession of the petitioners.

12. I heard the counsel the parties and perused the record.

13. The undisputed facts of the present case are that one Ram Shankar Shukla had taken an agricultural loan from the Khadi Gramudyog Board for installation of “Kolhoo” in 1990 – 91 amount of ₹ 31,000/- and a further loan of ₹ 32,000/- from Kshetriya Gramin Bank, ₹ 40,000 From Uttar Pradesh Sahkari Gram Vikas Bank and to secure the said loan equitable mortgage was created by mortgaging the land at Gatta No. 423-Kha/0.115, 601-Ka/0.076, 611/1.00, and 925/0.526 total 4 plots with an area of 1.717 hectares. As the borrower could not repay the said loan, the Khadi Gramudyog Board sent notice to Collector, Rai Bareilly to recover an outstanding amount of Rs. 64,844/- from the petitioner. Consequently, recovery proceedings were initiated, and the petitioner approached this Court filing writ petition No. 763 (MS) of 2003 and this Court by means of order dated 12/03/2003 directed the petitioner to deposit an amount of ₹ 20,000 within one month and the rest of the amount in three quarterly installments. The petitioner in pursuance of the order of this Court had deposited the sum of ₹ 20,000/- on 19/04/2003 but did not deposit the remaining installments, and consequently recovery proceedings were recommenced as per directions of this Court, as the petitioner himself had failed to deposit the outstanding amount.

14. It is in pursuance to the recovery proceedings initiated by the respondents that the property mortgaged by the petitioner was sought to be auctioned. No person appeared in the auction, and consequently the auction was settled in favour of the State and the mortgaged property of the petitioner was purchased by the State for Re1/-. According to the entry made in the revenue records, pursuant to the confirmation of the auction on 03/03/2003 the name of the petitioner was deleted and in his place name of State of Uttar Pradesh was mutated by the Lekhpal on 16/04/2003.

15. Subsequently, the entire outstanding amount of loan has been repaid to the District, Khadi Gramoudyog, Rai Bareilly, under a onetime settlement scheme, and they have also issued a no due certificate and also released the mortgaged property as per the said certificate dated 26/11/2019.

16. The grievance of the petitioners which has been agitated in the present writ petition is with regard to setting aside the auction and mutating the name of the petitioners in relevant revenue records. The respondents having themselves permitted the petitioners to redeem the said loan, and the entire outstanding amount having been paid, the mortgage would

come to an end on the repayment of the entire outstanding amount of loan.

17. In the present facts and circumstances of the case, the other issue which arises for consideration is as to whether the State could have purchased the mortgaged property for Rs.1/- in the auction.

18. The proceedings for auction were initiated by the State under the provisions of U.P Zamadari Abolition and Land Reforms Act, 1950 as well as rules of 1952.

19. Section 284 of the Act deals with the attachment, lease and sale of holding of defaulter, which provides that Collector may in addition to or instead of any other processes hereinbefore specified, either of his own motion or on the application of the Land Management Committee, attach the holding in respect of which an arrear is due. Section 286 of the Act provides procedure and power to proceed against the interest of defaulter in other immovable property, which provides that if any arrears of land revenue cannot be recovered by any of the process mentioned in clauses (a) to (e) of Section 279, the Collector may realize the same by attachment and sale of interest of defaulter in any other immovable property of the defaulter.

20. Rule 281 of U.P.Z.A. & L.R. Rules, 1952 deals with procedure and power of sale of immovable property which *inter alia* provides that process for sale of holding under section 284 and other immovable property under section 286 shall be issued by the Collector. Rule 281 (2-A) of the said Rules provides that in case of sale of a holding the Collector shall auction the holding in lots of 1.26 Hectares (3.125 acres) to 5.04 Hectares (12.50 acres) after working out and announcing the land revenue and the estimated value of each lot. It should also be made clear that only those persons would bid in the auction / acquisition of land who would not contravene the provisions of Section 154.

21. For ready reference Rule 281 of the U.P.Z.A. & L.R. Rules is quoted as under:

"281. Section 284.-

{(1) Recourse can only be had to the sale of the holding under Section 284 when the process specified in clause (a), (b), (c) and (d) of Section 279 would be insufficient for the recovery of the arrear.

{(2) Process for sale of holding under Section 284 and of other immovable property under Section 286 shall be issued by the Collector.

(2-A)--In the case of sale of a holding the Collector shall auction the holding in lots of 1.26 hectares (3.125 acres) to 5.04 hectares (12.50 acres) after working out and announcing the land revenue and the estimated value of each lot. It should also be made clear that only those persons would bid in the

auction, acquisition of land by whom would not contravene the provisions of Section 154.}

*{(3) * * *}"*

22. Rule 282 of said Rules provides that proclamation for sale shall be in Z.A. Form 74. Rule 283 provides that in proclamation for sale under section 286, the Collector shall state the amount of the annual demand and the estimated value of the property calculated in accordance with the rules in Chapter XV of the Revenue Manual. For ready reference the provisions of Rules 282 and 283 are quoted as under:

"282. Section 286.- The proclamation for sale shall be in Z.A. Form 74.

283. In proclamation for sale under Section 286, the Collector shall state the amount of the annual demand and the estimated value of the property calculated in accordance with the rules in Chapter XV of the Revenue Manual." 17. Rule 285-A provides the officer authorised and time frame for holding auction sale as under: "285-A. Every sale under Sections 284 and 286 shall be made either by the Collector in person or by an Assistant Collector specially appointed by him in this behalf. No such sale shall take place on a Sunday or other gazetted holiday, or until after the expiration of at least thirty days from the date on which the proclamation under rule 282 was issued. The Collector may from time to time postpone that sale."

23. Rules 285-H, 285-I, 285-J and 285-K deal with the grounds and procedure for setting aside the sale and confirmation of sale, as under: "285-H. (1) Any person whose holding or other immovable property has been sold under the Act may, at any time within thirty days from the date of sale, apply to have the sale set aside on his depositing in the Collector's office-- (a) for payment to the purchaser, a sum equal to 5 per cent of the purchaser money; and (b) for payment on account of the arrear, the amount specified in the proclamation in Z.A. Form 74 as that for the recovery of which the sale was ordered, less any amount which may, since the date of such proclamation of sale, have been paid on that account; and (c) the costs of the sale. On the making of such deposit, the Collector shall pass an order setting aside the sale: Provided that if a person applied under Rule 258-I to set aside such sale he shall not be entitled to make an application under this rule. (2) .

285-I. (i) At any time within thirty days from the date of the sale, application may be made to the Commissioner to set aside the sale on the ground of some material irregularity or mistake in publishing or conducting it; but no sale shall be set aside on such ground unless the applicant proves to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that he has sustained substantial injury by reason of such irregularity or mistake.

(ii) { }. (iii) The order of the Commissioner passed under this

rule shall be final.

285-J. *On the expiration of thirty days from the date of the sale if no such application as is mentioned in Rule 285-H or Rule 285-I, has been made or if such application has been made and rejected by the Collector or the Commissioner, the Collector shall pass an order confirming the sale after satisfying himself that the purchase of land in question by the bidder would not be in contravention of the provisions of Section 154. Every order passed under this rule shall be final.*" 285-K. *If no application under Rule 285-I is made within the time allowed therefor, all claims on the ground of irregularity or mistake in publishing or conducting the sale shall be barred: Provided nothing contained in this rule shall bar the institution of a suit in the Civil Court for the purpose of setting aside a sale on the ground of fraud.*"

24. Before dealing with rival contentions of parties, it would be useful to refer some decisions of the Apex Court, having material bearing on the question in controversy involved in the case, hereinafter.

25. In the case of **Union Bank of India Vs. Official Liquidator, 2000 (5) SCC 274**, the Apex Court has observed as under:-

"In auction-sale of the property of the company which is ordered to be wound up, the Company Court acts as a custodian for the interest of the Company and its creditors. It is the duty of the Company Court to satisfy itself as to reasonableness of price by disclosing valuation report to secured creditors of the company and other interested persons. It was further held that the Court should exercise judicial discretion to ensure that sale of property should fetch adequate price. For deciding what would be reasonable price, valuation report of an expert is essential. The Company Judge himself must apply his mind to the valuation report. The Court observed that the High Court did not interfere with the auction-sale on the ground of sympathy for the workers which was not proper. The auction-sale was, therefore, set aside by this Court and the Official Liquidator was directed to resell the property after obtaining fresh valuation report and after furnishing copy of such report to secured creditors."

26. In **Divya Manufacturing Company (P) Ltd. and another Vs. Union of India and others, AIR 2000 SC 2346**, the Apex Court held that in appropriate cases, even the confirmed sale can be set aside.

27. In **Gajraj Jain v. State of Bihar and others, (2004) 7 SCC 151**, the Apex Court held that in absence of valuation report and reserve price, the auction sale becomes only a pretence and if there is no proper mechanism and if the intending purchasers are not able to know the details of the assets or 10 intemised

valuation, the auction-sale cannot be said to be in accordance with law. If publicity and maximum participation is to be attained, all bidders must know the details of the assets and the valuation thereof.

28. In **State of Uttar Pradesh and others Vs. Swadeshi Polytex Limited and others (2008) 12 SCC 596** the sale proclamation had been issued on 1.4.2005 without any valuation of properties and only the area of vacant land had been specified therein and it was this notice that had been served on the chowkidar on 21.4.2005 and publication had been made in newspaper on 22.4.2005. The auction was held on 2.5.2005. In backdrop of this case, it was found that there was clear violation of Rules 282 and 283 of U.P.Z.A. & L.R. Rules. The Apex Court further held that the question of valuation is of the utmost importance as it is designed to ensure the best price for the property and it is essential in this circumstance that wide publication and notice of the proposed sale should be given as per Rule 285-A of the Rules. The pertinent observations made by Apex Court in paras 31 and 37 of the aforesaid decision are quoted as under:-

"31. Rule 283 provides for the estimated value of the property to be determined under the provisions contained in Chapter XV of the Revenue Manual. The said Chapter specifies the procedure for valuation of the property in terms of other similar properties. It is, however, clear from the record that the figure Rs.27 crores, the value of the property which is mentioned in the advertisement in Amar Ujala, appears to have picked up without any basis as it is not the case of UPSIDC that the property had been valued in accordance with the provisions of the Revenue Manual or by a valuer or expert in the field.

*37. The question of valuation is to our mind of the utmost importance as it is designed to ensure the best price for the property and it is essential in this circumstance that wide publication and notice of the proposed sale should be given as per Rule 285-A which postulates a notice of 30 days between the date of issuance of the sale proclamation and the date of auction. It can hardly be overemphasised that the proper valuation of the property and wide publicity of the proposed auction is intimately linked with the price that the auction fetches. As already mentioned above, the auction had been held on 2.5.2005. The sale proclamation had been issued on 1.4.2005, and served on the chowkidar on 21.4.2005, the publication made in Amar Ujala on 22.4.2005 whereas Rule 285-A itself postulates a notice period of 30 days to be counted from the date of issuance of the sale proclamation. While dealing with a similar situation, this is what this Court had to say in **S.J.S. Business Enterprises (P) Ltd. Vs. State of Bihar 2004 (7) SCC 166** (SCC 175- 76, paras 17-18) "*

31. We are of the view that the sale effected in favour of Respondent 6 cannot be sustained. It is axiomatic that the statutory powers vested in State financial corporation under the State Financial Corporations Act, must be exercised bona fide. The presumption that public officials will discharge their duties honestly and in accordance with the law may be rebutted by establishing circumstances which reasonably probabalise the abuse of that power. In such event it is for the officer concerned to explain the circumstances which are set up against him. If there is no credible explanation forthcoming the court can assume that the impugned action was improper. (See **Pannalal Binraj Vs. Union of India, AIR a p. 409**) Doubtless some of the restrictions placed on State financial corporations exercising their powers under Section 29 of the State Financial Corporations Act, as prescribed in **Mahesh Chandra Vs. U.P. Financial Corpn.** are no longer in place in view of the subsequent decision in **Haryana Financial Corpn. Vs. Jagdamba Oil Mills.** However, in overruling the decision in Mahesh Chandra this Court has affirmed the view taken in **SIPCOT v. Contromix (P) Ltd. 1995 (4) SCC 595** and said that in the matter of sale under Section 29, State financial corporations must act in accordance with the statute and must not act unfairly i.e. unreasonably. If they do, their action can be called into question under Article 226. Reasonableness is to be tested against the dominant consideration to secure the best price for the property to be sold.

"12. This can be achieved only when there is maximum public participation in the process of sale and everybody has an opportunity of making an offer. Public auction after adequate publicity ensures participation of every person who is interested in purchasing the property and generally secures the best price." (SIPCOT case, SCC p. 601, para 12)

29. Adequate publicity to ensure maximum participation of bidders in turn requires that fair and practical period of time must be given to purchasers to effectively participate in the sale. Unless the subject-matter of sale is of such a nature which requires immediate disposal, an opportunity must be given to the possible purchaser who is required to purchase the property on 'as-is-where-is basis' to inspect it and to give a considered offer with the necessary financial support to deposit the earnest money and pay the offered amount, if required.

We must, therefore, repel Mr Dwivedi's argument that as SPL had suffered not prejudice in the auction proceedings, the sale should not be interfered with."

29. Thus, on a close analysis of the aforesaid decisions it is clear that in **Union Bank of India Vs. Official Liquidator** (supra) the Apex Court has held that in auction sale of property of company which is ordered to be wound up, the Company

Court acts as custodian for the interest of company and its creditors. It is the duty of the Company Court to satisfy itself as to reasonableness of price by disclosing valuation report to secured creditors of the company and other interested persons. The Court should exercise judicial discretion to ensure that sale of property should fetch adequate price. For deciding what would be reasonable price, valuation report of an expert is essential.

30. In ***Gajraj Jain Vs. State of Bihar and others*** (supra) it was held that in absence of valuation report and reserved price the auction sale becomes only a pretence and if there is no proper mechanism and if intending purchasers are not able to know the details of the asset or itemised valuation, the auction sale cannot be said to be in accordance with law. If publicity and maximum participation is to be attained, all the bidders must know the details of asset and valuation thereof.

31. In ***State of Uttar Pradesh and others Vs. Swadeshi Polytex Ltd.*** (supra) the Apex Court has held that the question of valuation is of utmost importance as it is designed to ensure the best price for the property and it is essential that wide publication and notice of proposed sale should be given as per Rules 285-A of the Rules.

32. In ***SIPCOT vs. Contromix (P) Ltd.*** 1995 (4) SCC 595 it was held by the Apex Court that reasonableness is to be tested against dominant consideration to secure best price for the property to be sold. The Apex Court further held that this can be achieved only when there is maximum public participation in the process of sale and everybody has opportunity of making offer. Public auction after adequate publicity ensures participation of every person who is interested in purchasing the property and generally secures the best price. It was further observed that adequate publicity to ensure maximum participation of bidders in turn requires that fair and practical period of the time must be given to purchasers to effectively participate in the sale. Unless the subject matter of sale is of such a nature which requires immediate disposal, an opportunity must be given to the possible purchaser who is required to purchase the property on 'as-is-where-is basis' to inspect it and to give a considered offer with the necessary financial support to deposit the earnest money and pay the offered amount, if required.

33. From the aforesaid judgements, it is clear that whenever a property is put up for auction to realise the outstanding amount of dues, one of the main considerations is to get the maximum value out of the said property. For the said purpose, it is an essential condition that there should be proper valuation of the property, for which purpose provision has been made even in the Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act. Even in a

situation where no person appears to participate in the auction and no bidders participate in the auction, Collector has been given the discretion to bid up to the amount of such arrears. Rule 285B of the said Act is quoted here for ready reference:-

"285B. No officer having any duty to perform in connection with any such sale, and no person employed by, on subordinate to, such officer shall, either directly or indirectly, bid for, acquire or attempt to acquire the property sold or any interest therein :

Provided that where at any auction under Section 248 no bid is offered up to the amount of the arrear, for which the sale has been ordered, the Collector may bid upto the amount of such arrear."

34. In the facts of the present case, according to the State Government no one participated in the said auction and consequently the property was purchased by the State for Re 1/-. Even in a situation where no person has appeared to bid, it was open for the State to purchase the said property, but the reserve price had to be offered and paid. There is no law which permits the State to purchase the mortgaged property Re 1/-, which would be below the reserve price for 1.7 hectares of land anywhere. The said action of the State is clearly illegal and arbitrary and contrary to the statutory provisions of Rule 285B of the Act of 1950.

35. The State is under a mandate to act reasonably and fairly in all spheres of activity. Even the rules providing for sale of immovable property provide for a detailed mechanism where proper notices have to be issued, the property has to be valued before fixing the reserve price, and even the auction has to be fair and transparent. The action of the State in purchasing the property at an auction conducted by themselves for a price of Re. 1/- is nothing but confiscation of the property. Such a right cannot be vested in a democratic State, to confiscate the property of the citizen under the garb of a realisation of outstanding amount of loan for a paltry sum of Re.1/-. According to Rule 285B even if no one had participated in the auction, the minimum reserve price should have been paid for purchase of the said property. At this stage, we cannot lose sight of the Constitutional provisions contained in Article 300A.

36. According to Article 300 A of the Constitution of India '*no person can be deprived of his / her property save by authority of law*' and the State cannot dispossess a citizen of his / her property except in accordance with the procedure provided for in the Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Rules, 1952. In

the present case, deprivation of the property of the petitioner in purported exercise of the powers to sell mortgaged property to recovery amount of loan by the State Government and to purchase it at Re.1/- is nothing except confiscation of the property. The said action cannot be sustained on the anvil of the provisions contained in U.P.Z.A. and L.R. Act, especially Rule 285 B as quoted hereinabove and Article 300 A of the Constitution. It is surprising that when no person appeared during the auction why was not another date fixed after due publicity to ensure maximum participation at the auction but still the State proceeded with the said auction and settled in their own favour at a paltry sum of Re.1/-. On the touchstone In the Constitutional Scheme as well as under the statutory provisions and rules of U.P.Z.A. and L.R. Act, the said exercise is clearly arbitrary and illegal and deserves to be quashed.

37. In light of the above, this Court is of the considered view that once the agricultural loan taken by late Ram Shankar Shukla has been redeemed then the land which has been auctioned ought to have been reverted back to the petitioners, who are legal heirs of the borrower, namely Ram Shankar Shukla.

38. Learned counsel for the respondents do not object to the prayer made by the petitioners nor is there any legal basis for retention of the auctioned land.

39. Accordingly, the writ petition is **allowed**. The auction dated 16.1.2003 and its confirmation dated 3.3.2003 held by Sub Divisional Magistrate, Tahsil- Dalmau, District Raebareli, are set aside.

40. Considering the fact that the loan has already been redeemed, the State Government is directed to revert the land back to the legal representatives of the borrower, namely, Ram Shankar Shukla and necessary direction be issued to the revenue officers forthwith to pass necessary orders and mutate the name of legal heirs of late Ram Shankar Shukla.

(Alok Mathur, J.)

Order Date :- 25.1.2024
RKM.