



NON-REPORTABLE

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 1666 OF 2026
[**@ M.A. Diary No. 68849 of 2025 in SLP (C) No. 30380 of 2024**]

SATYA NARAYAN SHUKLA

...APPLICANT

VERSUS

**THE STATE OF UTTAR PRADESH
& ORS.**

...RESPONDENT(S)

J U D G M E N T

SATISH CHANDRA SHARMA, J.

1. The present miscellaneous application is arising out of order dated 16.10.2025 passed by learned Registrar of this Court in M.A. Diary No. 40865 of 2025 in SLP (Civil) No. 30380 of 2024.

2. The applicant before this Court is claiming himself to be a Sanyasi. Sanyas is the fourth and final stage in the traditional Hindu system of life stages, typically characterized by renunciation of material desires, family ties and worldly ambitions. The applicant, though claims to be a Sanyasi is

claiming land and monetary compensation. His right to claim land and compensation cannot be brushed aside only because of the fact that he is claiming to be a Sanyasi.

3. The facts of the case reveal that the applicant earlier came before this Court raising a grievance in respect of land which was allegedly encroached in the year 2002 by the State Government and the present applicant had filed SLP(C) No. 9085 of 2016 against the order dated 15.02.2016 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad, Lucknow Bench in F.A. No. 104 of 2014 and this Court appointed an Amicus Curiae for the applicant. This Court by an order dated 06.07.2021 passed in SLP (C) No. 9085 of 2016 dismissed the SLP holding that land bearing area 0.202 hectares of land has been allotted to the applicant in village Malloli in the year 2005. The order passed by this Court in SLP (C) No. 9085 of 2016 is reproduced hereinbelow:

“Mr. Shekhar Naphade, learned senior counsel, has been appointed as Amicus Curiae by this Court and has made submissions before this Court as to what, according to him, is the correct amount that ought to be awarded in this case. We do not find it necessary to get into this aspect for the reason that Ms. Ruchira Goel, learned counsel appearing for the State, has pointed out that in addition to the compensation that is payable under the impugned Judgment read with the Judgment of Additional District Judge, the petitioner has also been given 0.202 hectares of land in village Malloli wayback in

the year 2005. We record this submission and, therefore, dismiss the Special Leave Petition.”

4. The applicant not being satisfied in the matter, again came up before this Court by filing Miscellaneous Application No. 1203/2021 in disposed of SLP (C) No. 9085 of 2016 for recall of order dated 06.07.2021 and the said miscellaneous application was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 27.09.2021, which reads as under:

“The miscellaneous application for recall is dismissed. Pending application stands disposed of.”

5. The applicant thereafter approached the High Court of Allahabad by filing Writ Petition (C) No. 2927 of 2023 and the same was disposed of vide order dated 12.10.2023 which reads thus:

“1. Heard the petitioner appearing in person, learned Standing Counsel and Sri Aftab Ahmad, learned counsel for the respondent no.5.

2. Petitioner's main grievance is that despite the undertaking given before the Supreme Court, the petitioner is not provided 0.202 hectares of land. The order of Supreme Court dated 06.07.2021, reads as under:-

"Mr. Shekhar Naphade, learned senior counsel, has been appointed as Amicus Curiae by this Court and has made submissions before this Court as to what, according to him, is the correct amount that ought to be awarded in this case.

We do not find it necessary to get into this aspect for the reason that Ms. Ruchira Goel, learned counsel appearing for the State, has pointed out that in addition to the compensation that is payable under the impugned judgment read with the judgment of Additional District Judge, the petitioner has also been given 0.202 hectares of land in Village Malloli wayback in the year 2005. We record this submission and, therefore, dismiss the Special Leave Petition.

We express our gratitude to Sh. Shekhar Naphade, learned senior counsel, for the assistance rendered to this Court.

Pending application, if any, stands disposed of."

3. By the aforesaid judgment, the Supreme Court has rejected the claim of the petitioner for any further compensation. In case the order of the Supreme Court is passed on any incorrect statement made by any of the counsel appearing, remedy is available to the petitioner for contempt or otherwise before the Supreme Court.

4. With the aforesaid liberty, the writ petition stands disposed of."

6. The applicant thereafter preferred a Contempt Petition (C) [@ Diary No. 3636 of 2024 in SLP (C) No. 9085 of 2016] and the same was again dismissed as withdrawn. The applicant not being satisfied with the prolonged litigation in spite of the fact that the land was allotted to him in lieu of his land, preferred a Review Petition (Civil) No. _____ of 2024 (@ Diary No. 15364

of 2024) in SLP (Civil) No. 9085 of 2016 and the same also resulted in dismissal on 25.09.2024. The matter relating to allotment of land and grant of compensation in lieu of the applicant's plot on which a public road was constructed by the Gram Panchayat, has attained finality and the applicant is again and again approaching this Court for no rhyme or reason. The undisputed facts reveal that the applicant's plot on which the road has been constructed was admeasuring around 11000 sq. feet approximately and the applicant in lieu of the aforesaid plot has been allotted plot admeasuring around 21000 sq. feet of land. Not only this, monetary compensation has also been awarded to the applicant amounting to Rs. 7,58,575/- approximately. It is nobody's case that the applicant has not been allotted any land in lieu of the acquired land or has not been awarded compensation. On the contrary, a much bigger plot has been allotted to the applicant and a substantial amount has also been paid to him. He is running an Ashram over the land in question. The chronology of events in respect of the applicant's land, allotment of land in lieu of acquired land and grant of compensation are detailed as under:

Sr.	Date	Particulars
1.	2002	Incidental Acquisition : Construction of a public contact road (khadanja) by the Gram Panchayat, village Badel overlapped with Applicant's plot bearing Gata No. 132, measuring 0.010

		Ha. in Tehsil Nawabganj, District Barabanki.
2.	11.03.2005 – 20.09.2023	Compensation : Total compensation of INR 7,58,575 (Seven Lakh Fifty Eight Thousand Five Hundred and Seventy Five only) has been disbursed to the Petitioner/Applicant in lieu of the impacted land: 1. INR 1,96,442/- (One Lakh Ninety Six Thousand Four Hundred and Forty Two only), vide order dated 11.03.2005 which the Applicant accepted on 18.03.2006. 2. INR 1,39,655/- (One Lakh Thirty Nine Thousand Six Hundred Fifty Five only) in interest arrears, vide cheque dated 23.06.2020 which the Applicant accepted on 15.07.2020. 3. INR 4,22,478/- (Four Lakh Twenty Two Thousand Four Hundred Seventy Eight only) vide cheque dated 19.09.2023 has been received by the Applicant on 20.09.2023 albeit under protest.
3.	22.03.2005	Land Allotment (Malauli): Applicant was allotted another plot bearing Gata No. 1183B admeasuring area of 0.202 Ha. of agricultural land in his native village Malauli, Tehsil Ramnagar, District Barabanki on which he constructed an Ashram and Temple.
4.	2026	Official inspection confirmed the Applicant has utilized the plot measuring 0.202 Ha. bearing Gata No. 1183B allotted in village Malauli, Tehsil

		Ramnagar, District Barabanki to construct an Ashram and Temple exercising full ownership right.
--	--	---

7. The respondent - State of Uttar Pradesh has filed complete details in respect of payment made to the applicant as well as in respect of the land allotted to the applicant and the factum of allotment of land, grant of possession, construction of Ashram over it, has not been denied by the applicant himself. The applicant, in spite of the fact that he has constructed an Ashram over the land allotted to him, has preferred the present miscellaneous application along with the inter-locutory applications. In this regard, the Registry has submitted an office report dated 10.04.2026 which is reproduced hereunder:

“It is submitted that the SLP(C) No. 30380 of 2024 was dismissed vide this Hon’ble Court order dated 16.05.2025 (The copy of record of proceedings dated 16.05.2025 is marked as Annexure A-3 at page no. 21 in M.A. D. No. 68849/2025 paper books). Thereafter, Mr. Satyajeet Kumar, Advocate has filed M.A. Dy. No. 40865 of 2025 along with Application for clarification of Court’s order dated 16.10.2025, which was lodged vide Registrar Order dated 16.10.2025 (The copy of the said order is marked as Annexure A-1 at page nos. 13-18 in M.A.D. No. 68849/2025 paper books).

It is further submitted that Mr. Satyanarayan Shukla, petitioner-in-person after taking NOC from the erstwhile Advocate, Mr. Satyajeet Kumar, has

on 29.11.2025 filed this M.A.D. No. 68849 of 2025 along with Application for Appeal against Registrar Order dated 16.10.2025 (I.A. No. 309320/2025), along with application to appear and argue in person (I.A. No. 309322/2025) and application for condonation of delay of 28 days in filing the miscellaneous application (I.A. No. 309325/2025).

It is further submitted that the Registrar (Judicial Admin – I) has on 25.03.2026 interacted with the petitioner in person and the Registrar has opined that the petitioner may be provided with the services of ‘amicus’ to give necessary assistance to the Hon’ble Court for proper disposal of the matter. (Copy of interaction report is enclosed herewith).

It is further submitted that the advocate has filed fresh SLP paper books as the original paper books have been weeded out after due preservation as per rules.

The unregistered Miscellaneous Application along with Interlocutory Applications above-mentioned is listed before the Hon’ble Court with this office report.

Dated this 10th day of April, 2026.”

8. The unregistered miscellaneous application has been listed before this Court and this Court is of the considered opinion that the applicant in spite of the fact that the land has been allotted to him and compensation has been awarded to him, is repeatedly filing miscellaneous applications. It is nothing but a sheer wastage of precious time of this Court. The present

miscellaneous application not only deserves to be dismissed but deserves to be dismissed with heavy costs, however, keeping in view the fact that the applicant has appeared in person and has now become a *sanyasi*, this Court is refraining itself from imposing costs in the matter. However, this Court while disposing of the present miscellaneous application deems it fit to hold that no litigation in respect of the present subject matter shall be entertained by any Court in future as the grievance of the applicant has been remedied long back and the applicant has become a chronic litigant merely because indulgence has been shown to the applicant by this Court on earlier occasions.

9. The Miscellaneous Application stands dismissed with no orders as to costs.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

.....J.
[DIPANKAR DATTA]

.....J.
[SATISH CHANDRA SHARMA]

NEW DELHI
May 26, 2026