2026:AHC:209700

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - B No. - 4478 of 2026

Kedar Nath

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 10 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Dheeraj Kumar Yadav
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	Bhupendra Kumar Tripathi, C.S.C., Udai Bhanu Singh

Court No. - 51

HON'BLE ARUN KUMAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Dheeraj Kumar Yadav, learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Standing Counsel for respondent nos. 1, 2 & 3, Sri Udain Bhanu Singh, learned counsel for respondent no. 5.

2. Sri Bhupendra Kumar Tripathi, Advocate has accepted notice on behalf of respondent no. 4.

3. The present petition has been filed challenging the order dated 02.09.2026 passed by respondent no. 2 in proceedings arising under Section 30 of U.P. Revenue Code, 2006.

4. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioner that the revision filed by respondent no. 5 has been allowed on erroneous ground even though Plot No. 242 held by him was not affected by the adjustment directed to be made in the village map relating to the petitioner's bhumidhari Plot Nos. 229 and 232. It is further contended that the objections filed by the respondent no. 5 and other respondents were considered by the Additional Collector while passing the order dated 13.12.2023.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 5 has contended that the revision was not filed only by the respondent no. 5, but respondent nos. 6 to 8 were also revisionists in the revision filed before respondent no. 2. It is further contended that though the objection filed by the contesting respondent nos. 5 to 8 have been considered in the order dated 13.12.2023, but no reasons have been recorded for rejecting them. The perusal of the order dated 13.12.2023 subsequently records that none of the

opposite parties were present in person or through their counsel. As the aforesaid order was ex parte, it was rightly set aside by respondent no. 2. Therefore, no interference is warranted with the order dated 02.09.2026.

6. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and perused the records.

7. The order dated 13.12.2023 though records specific objections raised by the respondent nos. 5 to 8, but after recording their absence, the preparation of fresh field book has been accepted without recording any reason for its acceptance and for the rejection of the objection filed against it. The respondent no. 2, while passing the order dated 02.09.2026, has recorded a categorical finding that though the objections raised by the revisionist have been rejected, but no reasons have been recorded in support thereof. It is trite law that any order passed without reasons stand vitiated and cannot be sustained. The order of respondent no. 2 dated 02.09.2026 setting aside the order dated 13.12.2023 for deciding the matter afresh after considering the objection raised by respondent nos. 5 to 8 in accordance with law does not require any interference.

8. The writ petition lacks merit and is accordingly **dismissed**.

9. The parties are directed to appear before the Collector/Additional Collector, District Jaunpur, who shall decide the proceedings afresh, in accordance with the order of the respondent no. 2 dated 02.09.2026 in accordance with law, preferably within a period of three months from the date of production of certified copy of this order. It is further directed that the parties to the proceedings shall maintain status quo regarding nature and possession over the respective plot and shall not raise any construction till the decision of the case by the Collector/Additional Collector.

October 7, 2026
Sartaj

(Arun Kumar,J.)

Digitally signed by :-
SARTAJ AHMAD
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad