SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			WPMS/3327/2026 Darshana Rani Alias Sudharshana and others --Petitioners **Versus** Collector District Magistrate Haridwar and others --Respondents **Hon'ble Siddhartha Sah, J.** Mr. Pankaj Kumar Sharma, learned cousel for the petitioners. 2. Mr. Rahul Verma, learned Addl. A.G. assisted by Mr. Tarun Mohan, learned Brief Holder for the State/respondent nos. 1 to 3. 3. Mr. Ajay Veer Pundir, learned counsel for the respondent no.5. 4. By means of the present Writ Petition, the petitioners have sought direction to the respondents nos. 1, 2 & 3 to decide the Revision No. 96/2025-26, Smt Darshana Rani & others vs. Arya Pratinidhi Sabha & another under Section 48 of Consolidation of Holdings Act and further to conclude the proceedings of Transfer Application arising out of Revision No. 96/2025-26, Smt Darshana Rani & others vs. Arya Pratinidhi Sabha & another and to ensure the disposal of the revision in time bound period.

			5. Learned counsel pressing his prayer for expeditious and time-bound disposal of the Revision No. 96/2025-26 would submit that the petitioner no. 1 is an old lady aged 86 years and hopes and expects that her Revision may be decided expeditiously. 6. Learned counsel for the respondent 5 while referring to the order sheet of the aforesaid revision, would submit that there has not been a single adjournment attributable to the respondent no. 5. 7. Learned Additional Advocate General would oppose the said prayer while drawing the attention of the Court that the revision itself was preferred in the year 2026 and the revision itself has been filed with a long delay of almost 54 years, and as such, there would be no urgency in the matter. 8. The Honorable Supreme Court in the case of High Court Bar Association, Allahabad vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Others, reported in 2024 (6) Supreme Court Cases 267, in paragraph no. 47.3, has cautioned the constitutional Courts from issuing any directions for time-bound disposal of cases. 9. In such view of the matter, the prayer for a time-bound disposal of the aforesaid revision cannot be granted. However, in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, as the petitioner no. 1 happens to be an old lady of 86 years, it is hoped and expected that the District Deputy Director of Consolidation, Haridwar, will decide the aforesaid

			Revision as per law after granting the opportunity of hearing to the parties considering the advance age of the petitioner no.1. 10. The Writ Petition is disposed of accordingly. (**Siddhartha Sah, J.)** 03.11.2026 Shiv/