2026:AHC-LKO:40873

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW

MATTERS UNDER ARTICLE 227 No. - 3485 of 2026

Sarvar Ali Khan @ Sarvar Ali

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Commissioner, Ayodhya Division, Ayodhya And 5 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Aftab Ahmad
Counsel for Respondent(s) : C.S.C., Ghufran Hussain, Mohan Singh

---

Court No. - 3

HON'BLE KARUNESH SINGH PAWAR, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel, as well as learned counsel for respondent nos. 4 to 6.

2. A caveat application is stated to have been filed by Shri Gulfran Hussain on behalf of respondent nos. 2 and 3. The matter is being taken up in the revised list. However, neither in the first list nor in the revised list has anyone appeared on behalf of respondent nos. 2 and 3 despite the caveat having been filed.

3. Accordingly, with the consent of the parties, the present petition is being disposed of finally.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a suit was filed by the father of the respondent nos. 2 and 3 bearing Suit No. 5399 of 2015 under Section 176 of the Uttar Pradesh Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act, which was decided vide judgment and decree dated 03.03.2026 and 08.04.2026, passed by the Additional Magistrate -I, District Barabanki. Against the said judgment and decree, the petitioner has preferred Appeal No. 1188 of 2026 before the Board of Revenue, which is stated to be pending consideration.

5. It has further been contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that despite several dates fixed in the appeal, no effective hearing could take place either due to paucity of time or on account of resolutions passed by the Bar Association resulting in abstaining from work. He submits that the subject property is liable to be protected during the pendency of the appeal.

6. Considering the aforesaid, the present petition is ***disposed of*** with a direction that the pending application for stay in Appeal No. 1188 of 2026 filed before the Commissioner, Ayodhya Division, Ayodhya shall be decided expeditiously, after affording opportunity of hearing to both the

parties, preferably within a period of two months from the date a certified copy of this order is produced before the authority concerned.

7. Till the stay application is decided or for a period of two months, whichever is earlier, the parties shall maintain status quo.

8. It is made clear that this order shall be subject to the cooperation being extended by the petitioner in the proceedings before the Commissioner and the parties shall not seek unnecessary adjournments.

.

(Karunesh Singh Pawar,J.)

June 11, 2026
Preeti

Digitally signed by :-
PREETI GAUTAM
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad,
Lucknow Bench