HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 3496 of 2026

Panch Lal @ Chilampu

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Deputy Director Of Consolidation, And 15 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Dinesh Kumar Pandey
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 51

HON'BLE ARUN KUMAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Dinesh Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Standing Counsel for the State respondent nos. 1 to 3.

2. The present petition has been filed challenging the order of respondent no. 1, dated 30.05.2026, condoning the delay in filing the revision by the respondent nos. 4 to 10.

3. It is contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner that after dismissal of objection filed by the predecessor in interest of respondent nos. 4 to 10, late Santu, by the Consolidation Officer, he himself filed the appeal, which was dismissed by the Settlement Officer Consolidation during his lifetime. Santu did not challenge the order of the Settlement Officer Consolidation, dated 17.03.2018, during his lifetime. After death of Santu, his heirs i.e. respondent nos. 4 to 10 filed the revision with inordinate delay of about five years. Submission is that the respondent no. 1 did not consider the objection raised by the petitioner against the maintainability of the revision before respondent no. 1, therefore, the order under challenge is arbitrary and unsustainable.

4. I have considered the submissions made on behalf of the petitioner and perused the record.

5. It is not in dispute that the respondent nos. 4 to 10 are the legal heirs of late Santu whose appeal was dismissed by the order of Settlement Officer Consolidation, dated 17.03.2018. The respondent no. 1 while condoning the delay in filing the revision has accepted the explanation of revisionists

- respondent nos. 4 to 10 that during the lifetime of Santu, his counsel did not give information about disposal of the appeal, as such, the revision could not be filed within the prescribed period of limitation. Even otherwise, the order dated 30.05.2026 is an interlocutory order as no final adjudication has been made by the respondent no. 1, allowing or disposing of the revision, nor any adverse observation has been made against the claim of petitioner.

6. Even if the claim of respondent nos. 4 to 10 may not be justifiable under law, they cannot be denied opportunity to avail the statutory remedy of revision only for the fault of their counsel, who did not inform about the disposal of the appeal by the Settlement Officer Consolidation.

7. In view of the fact that the order dated 30.05.2026 has only condoned the delay in filing the revision and the claim of the parties is still to be adjudicated on merits, I find no good ground to interfere with the impugned interlocutory order, at this stage.

8. The writ petition being devoid of merit is, accordingly, dismissed. However, the Deputy Director of Consolidation, Azamgarh is directed to decide the Revision No. 0275 of 2023, in accordance with law, after hearing all the concerned parties, preferably, within a period of three months from the date of presentation of a certified copy of this order.

(Arun Kumar,J.)

October 23, 2026
Ashok Kr.

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