Neutral Citation : 2026:AHC-LKO:21285

Reserve Judgment
Reserved on 24.02.2026
Delivered on 25.03.2026

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW

AFR

WRIT – C No. – 704 of 2026

Shahban And Another

…..Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Addl. Chief Secy. Revenue, Lko. And Others

…..Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Abdul Haleem, Ashid Ali, Mohammad Danish, Mohammad Kashif, Mohd. Mansoor, Mohd. Shameem Khan

Counsel for Respondent(s) : C.S.C., Dilip Kumar Pandey

<u>Court No. 5</u>

HON'BLE ALOK MATHUR, J.

1. Heard Sri Mohd. Mansoor, learned counsel for the petitioners as well as Sri Yogesh Kumar Awasthi, learned Standing Counsel for the respondents.

2. The petitioner has challenged the proceedings under Section 67 of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006, whereby order is for eviction and imposition of penalty have been passed against the petitioner for having illegally encroached and built a mosque on land situated at Gata No. 648, area 0.300Hec., which is recorded as "**Khalihan**" in the revenue records and is consequently a land belonging to the Gram Sabha.

3. The proceedings were initiated by the issuance of a notice in RC form 19 requiring the petitioners to show cause as to why they should not be evicted from land situated at Gata No. 648, situated at Village – Asti, Pargana – Mohana, Tehsil - Bakshi-Ka-Talab, District - Lucknow. In pursuance of the notice, the petitioners had appeared before the Tehsildar on 11/12/2024 and filed their objections stating that they had not constructed a mosque on the Gram Sabha land, and the existing

mosque had been constructed 60 years before to facilitate the persons following Islam and further prayed for setting aside the notice.

4. The Tehsildar after considering the objections raised by the petitioners rejected the same holding that the land on which the mosque was existing at Gata No. 648 is recorded as "Khalihan" and therefore is a land owned by the Gram Sabha, and the petitioner does not have any right interest or title in the disputed land and therefore passed orders for eviction and imposition of penalty to the tune of Rs.36,000/-.

5. The petitioners, being aggrieved by the order dated 28/02/2025, preferred an appeal before the Additional District Magistrate (Judicial) Lucknow. The Additional District Magistrate after considering the entire material on record was of the view that the petitioner has not been able to demonstrate that he has any right, interest or title in the disputed property as the same was undisputedly recorded as Gram Sabha land and accordingly did not find any reason for interfering with the order dated 28/02/2025 passed by the Tehsildar and accordingly rejected the appeal by means of the order dated 31/10/2025.

6. Thereafter, the instant writ petition is filed by the petitioners assailing the validity of the order dated 28/02/2025, as well as the appellate order dated 31/10/2025.

7. It has been contended on behalf of the petitioners that there is a clear violation of the procedure prescribed under law by the Tehsildar since due opportunity of hearing was denied to the petitioner and the statement of the Lekhpal was never recorded and neither was any evidence led by the State, nor were the petitioners permitted to cross examine any of the witnesses for the State and hence prayed for setting aside of the orders of impugned in the writ petition.

8. In support of the submission, learned counsel, the petitioners has relied upon the judgment of a coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Rishipal Singh vs State of U.P & Others, Writ – C No. 6658 of 2022**. It was vehemently contended that the procedure to be followed by the authorities while exercising power under Section 67 of the U.P Revenue Code has been clearly laid down by this Court in paragraphs 74 and 75 of the aforesaid judgment, which read as follows:-

"74. Thus, in my view, the guidelines be adopted as procedure to be applied to proceedings under Sections 67,67A and 26 of the U.P.

Revenue Code. It is all aimed at ensuring transparency in the procedure, judiciousness in approach by the authorities and to thwart every complaint made with ulterior and oblique motive to dislodge a long settled possession and causing of unnecessary harassment to an innocent villager:

(i) In case of complaint made on RC From 19, the official making it shall ensure that proper survey is done in the light of observations made in this judgment; the land, occupation of which has stood identified to be unauthorized is in exact measurement and so also shown in the survey map prepared on scale, as per the Land Revenue Survey Regulations, 1978; the exact assessment of damages on the basis of circle rate with details of calculation made on that basis.

(ii) In a case of suo motu action, before issuing RC Form 20, the authority will ensure that proper report upon RC Form 19 is submitted as per para (i) above on parameters of subrule 1 Rule 67.

(iii) RC Form 20 must be accompanied by a copy of report and spot survey submitted alongwith RC Form 19 to the person against whom proceedings have been instituted, or even otherwise submitted in case of suo motu action vide para (ii) above.

(iv) Upon reply being filed to the notice, if authority finds that spot survey/explanation report is not satisfactory, it may order for a fresh spot report to be prepared in presence of the party aggrieved.

(v) In the event, objection includes a plea of statutory protection/ benefit under Section 67-A, the authority should invite the objection from the Gaon Sabha, and will decide the same alongwith the matter under Section 67, without requiring aggrieved party to move separate application under Section 67-A.

(vi) If the report is admitted on record, may be in case no objection is filed, the authority must ensure presence of the person preparing the report before it, to prove the report by his statement, with a right to aggrieved party to cross question him.

(vii) The authority must endeavour to decide the case within time framed provided under the relevant Act and the Rules and should

desist from granting adjournment to the parties in a routine manner.

(viii) In case of appeal under Section 67(5) of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006, preferred/ filed within the time prescribed alongwith interim relief application, the interim relief application as far as possible should be decided within two weeks' time with prior notice to other side and where plea of settlement under Section 67-A has been taken before Assistant Collector-1st Class, and damages to the tune of 25 % at-least of the total damages are paid and an affidavit of undertaking is filed for not raising any further construction upon the land in question, the authorities including civil administration should avoid taking any coercive measure pursuant to the order appealed against until the disposal of interim relief application. The Appellate authority may also consider granting interim relief on the very first day of filing of appeal with stay application if above conditions are fulfilled by the appellant.

(ix) The appellate authority should as far as possible decide the appeal within a period of two months of its presentation.

75. India lives largely in villages and still by and large is an agregarian economy. The State of Uttar Pradesh is no exception. Accordingly, I may observe here that rules of procedure deserve to be suitably amended by the State Government incorporating above guidelines for leaving no scope for any arbitrariness that is seen largely as influencing the decision making process by the authority, may be for local village politics.”

9. Sri Mohammed Mansoor, Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, contended that in paragraph 51 of the said judgment, in unequivocal terms, it has been observed that the conclusion can be reached by the Assistant Collector about the illegal encroachments only after examination of witnesses of the State’s side and also examination of witnesses produced by the aggrieved person. In paragraph 51, the justification for the said procedure was explained where it was observed that if proper procedure is followed by appreciating report in light of examination of witnesses and cross-examination and proper appreciation of evidence that may be led by the respective parties vis-a

vis spot inspection report, the order passed by the Assistant Collector 1st Class under sub-Rule 6 of Rule 67 read with Section 67 of the U.P. Revenue Code would be an order where one can say that justice is not only been done but has been seen to have been done.

10. It was submitted that the examination of witnesses is an essential feature of proceedings under Section 67 of the U.P. Revenue Code, and wherever the revenue officials are not examined or not permitted to be cross-examined, or the person under notice is not permitted to lead evidence, it will be assumed that the due procedure has not been followed and the entire proceedings are liable to be quashed. In the present case, it was submitted that only after submitting their reply, the proceedings were concluded and order was passed under Section 67 of the UP Revenue Code declaring the petitioners to be in illegal occupation of the Gram Sabha land, and such proceedings are in clear violation of the judgment of this court in the case of **Rishipal Singh (supra)** and therefore liable to be quashed.

11. Learned Standing Counsel has opposed the writ petition and submitted that the procedure prescribed under Rules 66 and 67 of the U.P. Revenue Code Rules has been followed. It was further submitted that proceedings under Section 67 of the U.P. Revenue Code are summary proceedings, and further that according to Section 225-A of the U.P Revenue Code clearly provides that all questions arising for determination in any summary proceedings before the Court, shall be decided upon affidavits in the prescribed manner and only where the revenue Court or revenue officer is satisfied that cross-examination of any witness who has filed affidavit is necessary, shall direct production of witness for such cross-examination. It was submitted that it is not mandatory for the Revenue officials to record the statement in such proceedings, and also to be cross-examined. In appropriate cases, the Assistant Collector, in his discretion, may permit such examination and cross-examination, but that will depend on the facts and circumstances of each case.

12. It was further submitted that in the case of **Rishipal Singh (supra)** this court had only proposed the procedure which ought to be followed in proceedings under Section 67 of the U.P Revenue Code and therefore as clearly stated in paragraph 74 of the said judgment that the guidelines be “adopted” as procedure to be applied to the proceedings under

Section 67, 67A and 26 of the U.P Revenue Code. Much emphasis was laid on the word “*adopted*” to canvass their submission that the existing rules will have to be amended before the procedure as stated in the said judgment could be applied universally in proceedings under Section 67 of the U.P Revenue Code, and as till date the rules have not been amended, the impugned orders cannot be tested on the anvil of procedure laid down in the judgment of **Rishipal Singh (supra)**. Lastly, it was submitted that where the statute itself prescribes summary proceedings in relation to Section 67 of the U.P Revenue Code, then, without quashing the existing provisions, a new set of rules prescribing regular proceedings cannot be prescribed, which are totally contrary to the prescription as per the revenue code rules, by the court, which would amount to legislation, which is impermissible.

13. I have heard the rival contentions of the parties and perused the record. The procedure which is to be followed for initiating and continuing an action under Section 67 of the U.P. Revenue Code has been provided in Rules 66 and 67 of the U.P Revenue Code Rules. It would be beneficial to quote the rules to find out about the nature of the proceedings and the requirements of law in this regard:-

“66. The information to Assistant Collector required by section 67(1) shall be submitted by the Chairman or any member or the Secretary of the Land Management Committee, or any officer of the Local Authority concerned in R.C. Form-19. Further inquiry by Assistant Collector (Section 67) 67.

(1) On receipt of the information under rule 66, or on facts otherwise coming to his knowledge, the Assistant Collector may make such inquiry as he deems proper and may obtain further information regarding the following points:-

(a) full description of damage or misappropriation caused or the wrongful occupation made with details of village, plot number, area, boundary, property damaged or misappropriated and market value thereof;

(b) full address along with parentage of the person responsible for such damage, misappropriation or wrongful occupation;

(c) period of wrongful occupation, damage or misappropriation and class of soil of the plots involved; (d) value of the property damaged or

misappropriated calculated at the circle rate fixed by the Collector and the amount sought to be recovered as damages.

(2) The Assistant Collector shall thereafter proceed to take action under section 67(2) and for that purpose issue a notice to the person concerned in R.C. Form-20 to show cause as to why compensation for damage, misappropriation or wrongful occupation not exceeding the amount specified in the notice be not recovered from him and why he should not be evicted from such land.

(3) If the notice referred to in section 67(2) remains uncomplied with or if the cause shown by the person 39 concerned is found to be insufficient, the Assistant Collector may direct by order that- (a) such person be evicted by using such force as may be necessary; or (b) the amount of compensation for damage or wrongful occupation ordered by the Assistant Collector, if not paid in specified time, may be recovered as arrears of land revenue, including the amount of expenses referred to in sub-rule (3).

(4) The amount of damages sought to be recovered and the expenses of execution of the order shall be specified in such notice, which shall be determined in the following manner:- (a) In the case of damage or misappropriation, the amount of damages shall be assessed at the prevailing market rate. (b) In the case of unauthorized occupation of any landthe amount of damages shall be the amount equal to the five percent of the market value of the land calculated at the circle rate fixed by the Collector for each year of unauthorized occupation.

(c) The expenses of execution of the order shall be assessed on the basis of one day's pay and allowances payable to the staff deputed.

(5) If the person wrongfully occupying the land has done cultivation therein, he may be allowed to retain possession thereof until he has harvested the crops subject to the payment by him of the amount equal to the five percent of the market value of the land calculated as per the circle rate which shall be credited to the Consolidated Gaon Fund or the Fund of the local authority other than the Gram Panchayat as the case may be. If the person concerned does not make the payment of the aforesaid amount within the period specified in the notice in R.C. 40 Form-20, the possession of the land shall be delivered to the Land Management Committee or the local authority, as the case may be,

together with the crop: Provided that where such person again wrongfully occupies the same land or any other land within the jurisdiction of the Gram Panchayat or the local authority as the case may be, he shall be evicted therefrom forthwith and possession of the land vacant or together with the crop thereon shall be delivered to the Land Management Committee or the local authority as the case may be.

(6) The Assistant Collector shall make an endeavour to conclude the proceeding under section 67 of the Code within the period of ninety days from the date of issuance of the show cause notice and if the proceeding is not concluded within such period the reasons for the same shall be recorded.

(7) Nothing in sub-rule (5) shall debar the Land Management Committee or the local authority as the case may be from prosecuting the person who encroaches upon the same land second time in spite of having been evicted under the Code or the rules, under section 447 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

(8) There shall be maintained in the office of each Collector a register in R.C. Form-21 showing details of the amount ordered to be realized on account of damages and compensation awarded in proceedings under section 67.

(9) A similar register shall also be maintained by each tahsildar showing realization of damages and compensation awarded in such proceeding. The entries made in the register maintained at tahsil shall be compared with the register maintained by the Collector to ensure accuracy of the entries made therein. 41 (10) A progress report showing realization of damages and compensation awarded in proceedings under section 67 shall be sent to Board of Revenue, U.P., Lucknow by the fifteenth day of April and October every year. The Board after consolidating the report so received from the districts shall send it to the Government. (11) Nothing in rules 66 and 67 shall debar any person from establishment of his right, title or interest in a court of competent jurisdiction in accordance with the law for the time being in force in respect of any matter for which any order has been made under section 67 of the Code.”

14. The procedure as laid down for initiation of the proceedings under Section 67 of the Revenue Code, is based on information coming to the knowledge of the Assistant Collector about the encroachment on the Gaon Sabha land, who thereafter can proceed to conduct enquiry and obtain further information relating to the particular area of the land on which the encroachment has been made, the plot number, area boundary of the property and the market value. After receiving the entire details of the encroachment, a notice is required to be issued in RC Form 20 to the person who is alleged to have encroached upon the Gram Sabha land. The person so put under notice has a right to respond to the notice and file his objections, and in case he does not respond to the notice or his response is found to be insufficient or unsatisfactory, then orders can be passed for eviction from the said land, and also imposition of compensation for the damages for wrongful occupation.

15. Once the entire material as provided for under Section 67 (1) of the Rules has been obtained by the Assistant Collector, he has to issue notice in RC Form 20 to the person who is alleged to have occupied the Gram Sabha land. The said noticee has a right to respond and deny the allegations levelled against him. On consideration of the reply, the Assistant Collector is also mandated to return a finding that his reply is found to be insufficient, only then can he pass orders for eviction and levy damages for wrongful occupation.

16. It is at the stage of consideration of the reply of the concerned person, opportunity of hearing has to be provided, and pursuant to the hearing and giving full opportunity to rebut the allegations in the notice, a reasoned and speaking order has to be passed by the Assistant Collector, clearly demonstrating whether the concerned person has been able to demonstrate any right, interest or title in the disputed property, and also the fact is to whether the disputed land is recorded in the name of Gram Sabha.

17. With regard to the nature of proceedings, it is noticed that as per Section 225-A of the U.P. Revenue Code, 2006, it is provided that the proceedings will be summary in nature. Section 225-A, reads as follows:-

"***225-A*** *Determination of questions in summary proceeding.- Notwithstanding anything contained in other provisions of this Code,* *all the questions arising for determination in any summary proceeding under this Code shall be decided upon affidavits, in the manner prescribed: Provided that if Revenue Court or Revenue Officer is satisfied that the cross examination of any witness, who has filed affidavit, is necessary, it or he may direct to produce the witness for such cross examination.*"

18. Rule 192 of the U.P. Revenue Code Rules provides that all questions arising for the determination in any summary proceedings under the Code shall be decided upon affidavits, and sub-rule (2) declares that the proceedings under Section 67 of the U.P Revenue Code are to be treated as summary proceedings.

19. Accordingly, as per the statutory scheme under Section 67 of the Revenue Code, providing for action to be taken against damage, misappropriation and wrongful occupation of Gram Sabha property, the Assistant Collector on receiving such information and after satisfying himself about the damage, misappropriation and wrongful damage to the Gram Sabha property shall issue a notice in Form 20 giving full information as provided therein. The person to whom the notice has been issued would, thereafter, have a full opportunity to submit his defence. The Assistant Collector, at this stage, can file all the material on affidavit in support of his contentions. As per the proviso to Section 225 A of the U.P Revenue Code, he may be permitted to cross-examine any witness who has filed an affidavit.

20. In the instant case, information in the Form 19 was submitted by the Land Management Committee to the Assistant Collector stating that the petitioners have encroached upon the land situated at Gata No. 648 on an area of 0.300 hectares in Village - Asti, Pargana – Mohana, Tehsil - Bakshi Ka Talab, District - Lucknow, for a period of nearly 20 years. A map relating to the encroachment was also annexed. On the basis of information received by the Assistant Collector, notice in the form 20 was issued to the petitioners on 21/10/2024, asking them to submit their reply by 11/11/2024. The petitioners submitted a reply to the show cause notice on 11/12/2024. It was denied that the petitioners had encroached upon any land belonging to the Gram Sabha, and the disputed mosque was built by the members of the Muslim community about 60 years back. It was stated that they were not aware of facts relating to the construction of the said Mosque, and stated that there is

no encroachment on Gata No. 648, area 0.300 Hec. The petitioners further denied that they were part of the management of the Mosque or the manager/Mutwalee of the said Mosque, but only visited the Mosque for prayers.

21. The Tehsildar duly considered the reply submitted by the petitioners and found that the land situated at Gata No. 648 situated at Gram - Asti, Pargana – Mohana, Tehsil - Bakshi Ka Talab, District - Lucknow was recorded as a *Khalihan* in the revenue records and was accordingly a land belonging to the Gram Sabha over which the mosque had been illegally constructed and accordingly passed orders for eviction and imposition of penalty by means of the order dated 28/02/2025.

22. Being aggrieved by the order dated 28/02/2025, the petitioners had preferred an appeal before the Collector, Lucknow. The main ground of challenge was that the procedure adopted by the Tehsildar in deciding the objections of the petitioners, where the statement of the Lekhpal was not recorded, nor was he summoned, and the petitioners were not given an opportunity to cross-examine him. The Collector by means of this order dated 31/10/2025 rejected the appeal after recording that neither before the trial Court nor before the appellate Court, it has been stated that the petitioners had any right, interest or title over the said property which was recorded as a *Khalihan* and therefore a land belonging to Gram Sabha and therefore, did not find any merit in the appeal and accordingly dismissed the same.

23. The learned counsel of the petitioners has vehemently submitted that in the aforesaid circumstances the proceedings before the Tehsildar were clearly illegal and arbitrary in as much as the statement of the Lekhpal was never recorded and nor were the petitioners given any opportunity to cross-examine him as provided for in the judgment of the coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Rishipal (supra)** and therefore submitted that the petition deserve to be allowed, and the impugned orders are liable to be set aside and remand the matter back for adjudication afresh after following the procedure as stated by this Court.

24. We have heard the counsel for the parties and perused the record. The arguments of the petitioner have centered around the procedure to be followed in proceedings under Section 67 of the Revenue Code. The

existing procedure as contained in Rules 66 and 67 of the U.P Revenue Code Rules prescribes a summary procedure, while according to the petitioner, this Court, in the case of Rishipal, has prescribed a detailed regular procedure to be followed, which includes the leading of oral evidence and cross-examination of witnesses.

25. When tested on the anvil of the existing provisions contained in Rules 66 and 67 of the U.P. Revenue Court Rules we find that the enquiry was conducted by the revenue officials and they had submitted their report in Form 19, providing all the necessary ingredients regarding the location of the legal encroachment pursuant to which notice was given to the petitioners in Form 20, providing therein the extent of encroachment, area of encroachment etc. and asking the petitioners to submit their reply. The reply was furnished to the Assistant Collector, who did not find that there was any justification given by the petitioners for occupation of the land at Gata No. 648, situated at Village - Asti, Pargana – Mohana, Tehsil - Bakshi Ka Talab, District - Lucknow, which was recorded as a "*Khalihan*" and hence a Gram Sabha land. As the petitioners were unable to demonstrate that they had any right, title, or interest in the said land, the Assistant Collector held that the reply was unsatisfactory and passed orders for eviction and imposition of a penalty. Accordingly, from the perusal of the aforesaid material, it is evident that the respondents have followed the Rules prescribed under Rule 66 and 67 of the Revenue Code Rules, and it cannot be said that the impugned order was passed in violation of the said Rules. With regard to the imposition of penalty, this Court is of the view that there was no material to link the petitioners to either construction or occupation of the Mosque the same cannot be sustained and is accordingly set aside.

26. The 2nd limb of the argument of the petitioners, which this Court proceed to examine, is with regard to the violation of the directions issued by the coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Rishipal (supra)**. In paragraph 50 of the said judgment, we find that the Court has provided for examination and cross-examination of the witnesses for the State and leading of evidence by the revenue authorities who had submitted the report with regard to the encroachment after spot inspection. In paragraph 74 of **Rishipal (supra)**, where the directions/guidelines have been issued with regard to the procedure to

be adopted under Sections 67, 67 A and 26 of the U.P Revenue Code, we find that in Clause (vi) of para 74 of the judgment of **Rishipal (supra)**, it is observed as under:-

"*(vi) if the report is admitted on record, maybe in case no objection is filed, the authority will ensure the presence of the person preparing the report before it, to prove the report by statement, with a right to the aggrieved party to cross-examine him* ."

27. Therefore, after carefully examining the aforesaid directions contained in para 74 of the said judgment, this Court finds that the remaining part of the directions are clarificatory/amplification of the provisions already contained in Rule 66 and 67 of the Revenue Code Rules but the major departure from the prescribed rules has been provided in Clause (vi) of paragraph 74 of the **Rishipal (supra)** according to which it would be mandatory for the authority to examine the person who submitted the report and to permit the said authority to be cross-examined. The issue is whether any order issued in violation of Clause (vi) of para 74 of **Rishipal (supra)** can be set aside without there being an amendment in the appropriate rules by the State Government?

28. It is trite to say that in the present circumstances, the Legislature has already framed rules which are provided for in Rules 66 and 67 of the Revenue Code Rules; it is not a case where there is any absence of any prescription with regard to the procedure to be followed in proceedings under Section 67 of the U.P Revenue Code enabling the Court to step in to fill the vacuum. The Supreme Court in the case of **Vishaka & Ors vs State Of Rajasthan & Ors, 1997 (6) SCC 241** had proceeded to frame guidelines with regard to the protection of women from sexual harassment at the workplace wherein they had clearly observed that in absence of domestic law occupying the field, to formulate effective measures to check evil of sexual harassment of working women at all workplaces. The situation before the Supreme Court can be clearly distinguished from the facts of the present case, where specific, valid, and enforceable rules exist; therefore, there was no occasion to exercise the extraordinary powers of formulating enforceable guidelines unless and until the existing rules are declared to be ultra vires.

29. We further take notice of the fact that this Court in the case of **Rishipal (supra)**, has not discussed the inadequacy or any infirmity with the existing procedure prescribed in the U.P Revenue Code Rules, but suggested a fresh mechanism in itself and termed it as "*guidelines*" to be adopted as procedure under Section 67, 67A and 26 of the U.P Revenue Code. Once the Court itself has issued directions for the "adoption" of the said guidelines/rules by the State of U.P., then such adoption is necessary, and without such adoption, the guidelines framed by this Court cannot be implemented. Apart from the above, we find that in case the guidelines in the case of **Rishipal (Supra)** are adopted and implemented, then the procedure, which hitherto was a summary procedure, would be converted in regular procedure providing for determination only after parties are given due opportunity to adduce evidence. It is for the aforesaid reason that we do not find that there was any intention to make the guidelines enforceable as such prior to adoption by the State, and necessary amendments in the rules, and therefore, do not have any hesitation in holding that proceedings under Section 67 of the U.P Revenue Code would have to be judged on the anvil of the existing procedure, till such time as the guidelines framed in the case of **Rishipal (supra)** are adopted by the state by amending the U.P Revenue Code Rules.

30. It is in the aforesaid circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that the procedure which is prescribed under Rule 66 and 67 of the Revenue Code Rules has been followed in the present case, while it is not mandatory to follow the guidelines issued in the case of **Rishipal (supra)**, unless and until the same are adopted by the State of U.P.

31. The writ petition is accordingly **dismissed**.

(Alok Mathur, J.)

March 25, 2026

A. Verma