2026:AHC:207797

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 2916 of 2026

Smt Jaywati

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 6 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Subhash Chandra Yadav
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Ashish Kumar Singh, C.S.C., Deepak Rana

Court No. - 50

HON'BLE ASHUTOSH SRIVASTAVA, J.

1. Heard Sri Subhash Chandra Yadav, learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri Ashish Kumar Singh, learned counsel who has put in appearance on behalf of respondent no. 4 chak holder No. 103, learned Standing Counsel for the State respondents. Considering the nature of the orders proposed to be passed the notice upon the private respondents is being dispensed with.

2. Challenge in this petition is to the order dated 24.04.2026 passed by the Deputy Director of Consolidation as well as the order dated 22.08.2024 passed by the Settlement Officer Consolidation in appeal. Further reliefs in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondents not to interfere in the possession of the petitioner over chak No. 526 at the stage of consolidation officer has been prayed for.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is the chak holder of chak No. 526. Her original holding comprised of Gata No. 209 and 260/2. The Assistant Consolidation Officer proposed chaks over Gata No. 209 and 211. Objections were filed by the petitioner against the proposed chak and the same was allowed by the Consolidation Officer vide order dated 15.02.2024 and the petitioner was proposed chak over Gata No. 260/2 which was her original holding. An appeal is said to have been filed against the order of the Consolidation Officer by the contesting respondent. The

same came to be allowed vide order dated 22.08.2024 and as a consequent of the appeal being allowed, the petitioner has been allotted chak over Gata No. 260/2, 261 and 262. Aggrieved by the allotment of the chaks by Settlement Officer of Consolidation, the petitioner filed a revision before the Deputy Director of Consolidation. The revision has been dismissed and the petitioner has been proposed one chak over Gata No. 209D.

4. Counsel for the petitioner argued that the allotment of the chak at the Consolidation Officer level was just and proper and ought not to have been disturbed by the Settlement Officer of Consolidation as well as the Deputy Director of Consolidation. The Deputy Director of Consolidation under the impugned order has declined the adjustment of the chak in favour of the petitioner on the ground of one solitary chak over Gata No. 209 which is the original holding of the petitioner has been maintained.

5. I have gone through the reasoning contained in the impugned order and find that the Deputy Director of Consolidation was perfectly justified in allotting one solitary chak over the original holding of the petitioner over Gata No. 209. The order passed by the Deputy Director of Consolidation is just and proper and call for no interference by this Court.

6. Accordingly, the writ petition failed and is, accordingly, dismissed.

October 5, 2026
v.k. updh.

(Ashutosh Srivastava,J.)

Digitally signed by :-
VINOD KUMAR UPADHYAY
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad