



2025:004-1 K03:00051

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - C No. - 11548 of 2025

Gyan Ratan Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Revenue Deptt. Lko. And 4
Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Raghvendra Pratap Singh, Ashish Kumar Singh, Kapil Dev Chaubey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C., Dilip Kumar Pandey

Court No. - 22

HON'BLE ARUN KUMAR SINGH DESHWAL, J.

1. Heard Sri Raghvendra Pratap Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri Dilip Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the Gaon Sabha and Sri Dev Prakash Mishra, learned Standing Counsel for the State.

2. Present petition has been filed for the following relief:

"(i) A writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari thereby quash/set-aside the impugned order dated 25.10.2025 passed by Additional Commissioner (Administration) Lucknow Division, in Case No.-1673/2024, Computerised Case No.-C202410000001673, U/s 210 UP Revenue Code as well as impugned order dated 12.3.2024 passed by Additional District Magistrate (F/R), Lucknow in case no. 251/2023 Computerised Case No-D202310460000251, U/s 30 of the aforesaid act (contained in Annexure No. 1 and 2) to this petition respectively.

(ii) To issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding and directing the opposite party No. 3 and 4 to make the correction in the map of Gata No. 358 in accordance with law."

3. Contention of learned counsel for the petitioner is that petitioner has filed an application u/s 30 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 (in short 'the Code, 2006') to correct the map and during that proceeding, a report was called from the concerned Lekhpal. As per this report, it was found that though from the map, it appears that gata no.357 is having excess land which can be adjusted towards the land of the petitioner in gata no.358 and it was also mentioned in that report that there is also deficiency in gata nos.356, 359, 361, 362 and 363. Therefore, the tenure holder of these gatas should also be made

party and in absence of party, application u/s 30 of the Code, 2006 is not maintainable. Against that order, revision was filed by the petitioner which was also dismissed by the impugned order dated 25.10.2025 on the ground that application of the petitioner u/s 30 of the Code, 2006 was found non joinder of necessary party. Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that as the shortage of the area can be remedied by taking excess land from gata no.357, therefore, there is no requirement of impleading the tenure holder of other adjoining gata.

4. Considering the aforesaid submission and taking into account, it is not in dispute that deficiency in the gata of the petitioner can be taken from gata no.357 but the report of the Tehsildar also shows that there is deficiency in the other gata adjoining to the land of the petitioner. Therefore, there is no illegality in the impugned order rejecting the application for non joinder of the party.

5. However, petitioner is permitted to file fresh application u/s 30 of the Code, 2006 by impleading the *bhoomidhar* of adjoining land as mentioned in the report of Tehsildar dated 20.12.2023.

6. With the aforesaid observation, present petition is **disposed of**.

7. In case the said application is filed by the petitioner, within a period of 30 days then same shall be decided in accordance with the direction laid down by this court in the case of **Daya Shankar vs. State of U.P. and 4 others** reported in **2023(6) ADJ 181**, dated **19.05.2023**.

December 3, 2025
S.C.

(Arun Kumar Singh Deshwal,J.)