



2025:AHC-LKO:53846

A. F. R.

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD  
LUCKNOW**

**MATTERS UNDER ARTICLE 227 No. - 5261 of 2025**

Lala Singh And 3 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Chairman, Board Of Revenue, Lko. And Others

.....Respondent(s)

---

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Santosh Kumar Srivastava, Manish  
Kumar Shukla

Counsel for Respondent(s) : C.S.C.

---

**Court No. - 5**

**HON'BLE ALOK MATHUR, J.**

1. Heard Sri S. K. Srivastava, learned counsel for the petitioners and the Standing counsel for the respondents.

2. The grievance raised by the petitioners in the present writ petition is with regard to pendency of revision No.553 of 2023, computerized case No.R 2023104600553 (*Randheer Singh Vs. Anurudha Singh*) under Section 333 of U.P.Z.A. & L.R.Act which is pending before Board of Revenue. It has been submitted that arguments in the said case were heard on 16.2.2025 and the judgment was reserved and even after expiry of six months the judgment was not declared and, therefore, in the present writ petition following prayer has been made:-

*"(a) (i) To issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the specially O.P. No.1 to decide the Revision No.553 of 2023 bearing computerized case No.R 2023104600553 Randheer Singh Vs. Anurudha Singh under Section 333 of U. P. Z. A. L. R. Act, 1950 within 3 months.*

*(b) To issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the specially O.P. No.1 to release the Revision No.553 of 2023 bearing computerized case No.R 2023104600553 Randheer Singh Vs. Anurudha Singh under Section 333 of U. P. Z. A. L. R. Act, 1950 for*

*further argument/hearing."*

3. Instructions were sought from the Board of Revenue to indicate the reasons whether the fact was correct and the matter was pending and judgment has been reserved for being pronounced. Learned Standing counsel has obtained instructions from Chairman, Board of Revenue and informed that the matter is likely to be re-heard and the next date fixed is 16.9.2025.

4. The aspect pertaining to the period within which judgments for the reserved cases have to be pronounced was considered by Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Anil Rai Vs. State of Bihar, (2001) 7 SCC 318** where with regard to High Courts it was directed that where judgment is not pronounced within three months from the date of reserving it, any of the parties in the case is permitted to file an application before the court concerned with prayer for early judgment and in case such an application is filed the same shall be listed before the said Bench within two days and when the judgment is not pronounced within six months, any of the parties would be entitled to move an application before the next superior authority/court to withdraw the said case and for being listed before another Bench for fresh arguments.

5. We see no reason as to why the said pronouncement of the Supreme Court should not be extended even to the revenue courts to decide the title disputes as a substitute to the civil courts. The pronouncement of Supreme Court in the case of **Anil Rai Vs. State of Bihar (2001) 7 SCC 318** passed in Criminal Appeals @ SLP (Crl.) No.s 4509-4510 of 2025 is as follows:-

*"9. It is true, that for the High Courts, no period for pronouncement of judgment is contemplated either under the Code of Civil Procedure or the Criminal Procedure Code, but as the pronouncement of the judgment is a part of justice dispensation system, it has to be without delay. In a country like ours where people consider the Judges only second to God, efforts be made to strengthen that belief of the common man. Delay in disposal of the cases facilitates the people to raise eye-brows, some time genuinely which, if not checked, may shake the confidence of the people in the judicial system. A time has come when the judiciary itself has to assert for*

*preserving its stature, respect and regards for the attainment of the Rule of Law. For the fault of a few, the glorious and glittering name of the judiciary cannot be permitted to be made ugly. It is the policy and purpose of law, to have speedy justice for which efforts are required to be made to come to the expectation of the society of ensuring speedy, untainted and unpolluted justice.*

*10. Under the prevalent circumstances in some of the High Courts, I feel it appropriate to provide some guidelines regarding the pronouncement of judgments which, I am sure, shall be followed by all concerned, being the mandate of this Court. Such guidelines, as for present, are as under:*

- (i) The Chief Justices of the High Courts may issue appropriate directions to the Registry that in case where the judgment is reserved and is pronounced later, a column be added in the judgment where, on the first page, after the cause-title, date of reserving the judgment and date of pronouncing it be separately mentioned by the court officer concerned.*
- (ii) That Chief Justice of the High Courts, on their administrative side, should direct the Court Officers/ Readers of the various Benches in the High Courts to furnish every month the list of cases in the matters where the judgments reserved are not pronounced within the period of that months.*
- (iii) On noticing that after conclusion of the arguments the judgment is not pronounced within a period of two months, the concerned Chief Justice shall draw the attention of the Bench concerned to the pending matter. The Chief Justice may also see the desirability of circulating the statement of such cases in which the judgments have not been pronounced within a period of six weeks from the date of conclusion of the arguments amongst the Judges of the High Court for their information. Such communication be conveyed as confidential and in a sealed cover.*
- (iv) Where a judgment is not pronounced within three months, from the date of reserving it, any of the parties in the case is permitted to file an application in the High Court with prayer for early judgment. Such application, as and when filed, shall be listed before the Bench concerned within two days excluding the intervening holidays.*
- (v) If the judgment, for any reason, is not pronounced within a period of*

*six months, any of the parties of the said lis shall be entitled to move an application before the Chief Justice of the High Court with a prayer to withdraw the said case and to make it over to any other Bench for fresh arguments. It is open to the Chief Justice to grant the said prayer or to pass any other order as deems fit in the circumstances."*

6. In light of the above, let the matter be re - heard and the arguments completed within two weeks from the date a certified copy of this order is produced before the court concerned and the judgment be pronounced within a period of six weeks thereafter, in accordance with law.

7. We further direct the authorities to follow the directions of Supreme Court in the case of *Anil Rai (supra)* in deciding the disputes before them.

8. Let a copy of this judgment be sent to Additional Chief Secretary (Revenue), Government of Uttar Pradesh for necessary compliance and for information to all the authorities concerned.

9. With aforesaid observations and directions the petition stands **disposed of**.

**(Alok Mathur,J.)**

**September 8, 2025**

RKM.