

## Ram Chander Vs Deputy Director of Consolidation

**Court:** Allahabad High Court

**Date of Decision:** May 26, 2009

**Hon'ble Judges:** Rajiv Sharma, J

**Final Decision:** Disposed Of

### Judgement

Rajiv Sharma, J.

None responds for the petitioner. However, Smt. Nafeesa Begum, who has filed an application for impleadment through Mr. Mohan Singh is

present. Mr. Mohan Singh has also filed counteraffidavit on behalf of the opposite party No.3.

Though the impleadment application has not been allowed till date, Mr. Mohan Singh, learned counsel appearing for the opposite party No.3

submits that in the consolidation proceedings, the name of the petitioner has been entered into the revenue records on the basis of the compromise

and the Consolidation Officer has decided the matter on the basis of the compromise, which is alleged to be forged one and as such, an appeal has

been filed and the appellate authority came to the conclusion that the compromise was not genuine and as such, the matter has been remanded to

the Consolidation Officer for deciding the matter afresh. The said order of the appellate authority was assailed by the petitioner before the Deputy

Director of Consolidation. While dismissing the revision, the revisional authority has recorded a finding that no interference was required and as

such, the order passed by the Settlement Officer (Consolidation) was confirmed. Being aggrieved, the instant writ petition has been filed.

I do not find any illegality or infirmity in the order passed either by the appellate authority or by the revisional authority. No interference is required

under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. However, the Consolidation Officer is directed to decide the case, latest by 30.9.2009, as the matter is

pending since long before the Consolidation Officer. All the pending miscellaneous applications stand disposed of.