



2026:AHC:209897-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 39558 of 2026

Tekam

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Amarjeet Choudhary, Sangam Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Anjali Upadhyya, C.S.C.

Court No. - 29

HON'BLE SIDDHARTHA VARMA, J.

HON'BLE RAM MANOHAR NARAYAN MISHRA, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners; Shri Devesh Vikram, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the respondents and Ms. Anjali Upadhyya, learned counsel for the Greater Noida Industrial Development Authority.

2. The petitioners have preferred present writ petition for direction to the respondents to allot 10% residential plot in terms of Full Bench judgement of this Court in **Gajraj Singh vs. State of UP and others 2011 (11) ADJ 1**.

3. Learned counsel for the respondents have placed reliance upon a judgement delivered by this Court dated 15.10.2025 passed in **Writ C No.29560 of 2025 (Damber Singh and another vs. State of U.P. and another)** connected with several other writ petitions. The operative portion of the judgement reads as follows:-

"30. Judicial propriety demands judicial discipline and thus, we respectfully agree with the judgments passed in the case of *Mange @ Mange Ram (supra)* and *Runwell India Pvt. Ltd. (supra)*, wherein the Division Bench had not found any good ground to grant the relief as prayed for and dismissed all the writ petitions. Hon'ble the Apex Court in *Khatoon's case (supra)* had also held that the Appellants have neither any legal right and nor any factual foundation to claim the relief of allotment of additional developed abadi plot. It is also not in

dispute that the State paid all statutory compensation, which is payable under the Act, to every landowners. Not only that every landowner also got additional compensation at the rate of 64.70% over and above what was payable to them under the Act. The reliefs in the case of Gajraj (supra) were confined only to the landowners, who had filed the writ petition. Even the Supreme Court in Savitri Devi's case (Supra) held that the directions given be not treated as precedent for being adopted to other cases in future and they be treated as confined to that case only.

31. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, it is clear that the petitioners do not have any vested right to claim the benefit of parity and they are not entitled to the reliefs as claimed by them in these writ petitions. The 10% developed land cannot be allowed to them, in view of law laid down by the Apex Court in the case of Savitri Devi (supra) and Khatoon (supra), wherein, it has been clearly held that the petitioners have neither any legal right nor any factual foundation to claim the relief of allotment of additional developed abadi land and therefore, no benefit can be granted to the petitioners.

32. Accordingly, all the writ petitions are dismissed."

4. Since the controversy involved in the present writ petition is identical to the aforesaid writ petitions, the present petition is, accordingly, dismissed in terms of the judgement in the case of **Damber Singh (supra)**.

(Ram Manohar Narayan Mishra,J.) (Siddhartha Varma,J.)

October 7, 2026

GS