2026:AHC:208166

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 33622 of 2026

Chandra Pratap Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Santosh Kumar Verma
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 37

HON'BLE CHANDRA KUMAR RAI, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Anshul Nigam, learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondents.

2. The instant petition has been filed for the following reliefs:

"A. Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondent no. 2/ Tehsildar, Tehsil Rudhauli, District Basti not to pass any effective order against the petitioner on the basis of the report submitted by the respondent no.3 and 4 dated 14/20.02.2026, during the pendency of the application U/s 30(1) of U.P. Revenue Code dated 24.02.2026 filed by the petitioner for correction of map.

B. Issue a writ order or direction in the nature of Mandamus directing the respondents not to interfere in the peaceful possession of the petitioner over the land in dispute."

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the proceeding under Section 30 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 initiated at the instance of the petitioner in respect to the plot in question is pending before Chief Revenue Officer, Basti, as such, the proceeding under Section 67 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 initiated against the petitioner should be stayed till the disposal of the proceeding under Section 30 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006.

4. Learned Standing Counsel for the State submitted that the petitioner should contest the pending proceeding under Section 67 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 in accordance with law rather writ petition before this Court for staying the proceeding of Section 67 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006. He

further submitted that the plot in question is recorded as rasta, as such, no right will accrue in favour of petitioner in any manner.

5. I have considered the argument advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel for the State and perused the records.

6. There is no dispute about the fact that the proceeding under Section 67 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 initiated against the petitioner is pending as Case No.909 of 2026, Computerized Case No.T202617140400909 before respondent no.2/Tahsildar, Tahsil- Radhauli, District- Basti.

7. The interest of justice requires that pending proceeding under Section 67 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 should be decided considering the petitioner's objection in accordance with law.

8. Considering the entire facts and circumstances of the case, the instant petition is finally disposed of directing respondent no.2/Tahsildar, Tahsil- Radhauli, District- Basti to decide the aforementioned pending proceeding under Section 67 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006 considering the petitioner's objection in accordance with law.

(Chandra Kumar Rai,J.)

October 5, 2026
Rameez

Digitally signed by :-
RAMEEZ AHMED
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad