2026:AHC:208798-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 39152 of 2026

Shri Chhote Lal

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Krishna Agarawal, Mohd Shahnawaz, Raj Kumar Gupta, Sushil Kumar Yadav
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 29

HON'BLE SIDDHARTHA VARMA, J.
HON'BLE KUNAL RAVI SINGH, J.

1. No one has appeared for the petitioner even in the revised list.

2. The writ petition has been filed with following prayers:-

" Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of i. Issue a MANDAMUS commanding the respondent No. 4, namely, the Assistant Engineer, Sharda Sahayak, Mahmadpur Rajwaha Nagar, Varanasi, and/or respondent authority, to the competent consider and decide the petitioner's application/representation dated 15.02.1996 seeking determination and payment of compensation in respect of the portion of land bearing Arazi No. 1694/1, Chak No. 101, situated at Mauja Baragaon, Madanpur, Pargana Kolsala, District Varanasi, which was utilized for the purposes of the canal, by a reasoned and speaking order, within such time as may be fixed by this Hon'ble Court;

ii. Issue a further appropriate direction to the competent respondent authority to consider the petitioner's claim after examining the relevant revenue records/Khatauni, the original document dated 28.03.1973, the acquisition/canal project records and all other relevan documents available on record, and to determine the petitioner's entitlement to compensation in accordance with law;

iii. Issue a further appropriate direction that, in the event the petitioner is found legally entitled to compensation upon such determination, the

amount so determined shall be paid to the petitioner within a reasonable period in accordance with law;

iv. Pass such other and further order or direction as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case;

v. Award the cost of the present petition in favour of the petitioner."

3. From the representation, which is at page 19, we find that it was filed on 15.2.1996. Ever since then, the petitioner has not approached this Court for any mandamus for getting his representation decided.

4. Learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel Sri Devesh Vikram has raised a preliminary objection regarding the maintainability of the writ petition and in this regard he has relied upon a judgment of this Court in **Dalip Singh and 4 others vs. State of U.P. and 3 others (2025:AHC:103267-DB)** and submitted that the prayer of the petitioner seeking mandamus cannot be considered at such a belated stage.

5. We do find substance in the submission made by the learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel.

6. In view of the above, we are refraining from interfering in the present writ petition. It is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Kunal Ravi Singh,J.) (Siddhartha Varma,J.)

October 6, 2026
PK

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