



2026:AHC:38216

Judgment Reserved on 05.02.2026

Judgment Delivered on 20.02.2026

A.F.R.

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 56747 of 2016

Satish And 97 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Adl.Commissioner Meerut Division Meerut And
32 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s) : Manish Dev Singh, Nipun Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s) : A.B.Singhal, Aditya Bhushan Singhal,
Akhilesh Kumar Ojha, C.S.C., Mahesh
Narain Singh, Santosh Kumar
Upadhyay, Sharad Kumar Srivastava,
Vinod Kumar Upadhyay

Court No. - 6

HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.

1. Heard Shri Nipun Singh, learned Senior Counsel assisted by Shri Abhijit Mishra, learned counsel for the petitioners, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of Respondent Nos.1 & 2 and Shri Sunil Kumar Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of Respondent No.3/Land Management Committee and Shri Vinod Kumar Upadhyay, learned counsel appearing on behalf of private-respondents.

2. Pleadings have already been exchanged between the parties, hence with the consent of the counsel for the parties, the present writ petition is decided at the admission stage itself.

3. The present writ petition has been filed by the petitioners inter-alia with the following prayers-

"i. Issue an order, direction, or writ in the nature of the certiorari quashing the impugned judgment and order dated 03-10-2016 passed by the respondent no. 1 herein ie Additional Commissioner, Meerut Division,

Meerut in revision no. 125/2015-15 Satish and others Vs. Jaipal and others, and revision no 126/2015-15 Harbhajan and others Vs. Ramgopal and others, and revision no. 117/2015-15 Ikram and others Vs Ravindra and others and in Revision no 116/2015-15 Kanwal Singh and others Vs. Raghuraj and others u/s 198(4) of U.P.Z.A. and L.R. Act (Annexure no.10 to the writ petition) and judgment and order dated 30-06-2016 passed by the respondent no. 2 herein ie Additional Collector/ADM (Administration), Bulandshahar in case no 17/2013 Brahm Singh and others Vs. Kanwal Singh and others, and in case no. 21/2013 Ravindra Singh and others Vs. Harbhajan Singh and others U/s 198(4) of U.P.Z.A. and L.R. Act 1950 (Annexure No.7 to the writ petition) whereby and whereunder the agricultural leases as executed in favour of petitioners herein has been determined/cancelled u/s 198(4) of U.P.Z.A. and L.R. Act on wholly erroneous exercise of jurisdiction.

ii. Issue an appropriate order or direction against the res. no. 1 and 2 herein not to dispossess the petitioners herein concerning the leased land in pursuance of judgment and order dated 03-10-2016 passed by the respondent no 1 herein ie. Additional Commissioner, Meerut Division, Meerut in revision no. 125/2015-15 Satish and others Vs. Jaipal and others, and revision no. 126/2015-15 Harbhajan and others Vs. Ramgopal and others, and revision no. 117/2015-15 Ikram and others Vs. Ravindra and others and Revision no. 116/2015-15 Kanwal Singh and others Vs. Raghuraj and others u/s 198(4) of U.P.Z.A. and L.R. Act (Annexure no.10 to the writ petition) and judgment and order dated 30-06-2016 passed by the respondent no. 2 herein i.e. Additional Collector/ADM (Administration), Bulandshahar in case no. 17/2013 Brahm Singh and others Vs. Kanwal Singh and others, and in case no. 21/2013 Ravindra Singh and others Vs. Harbhajan Singh and others U/s 198(4) of U.P.Z.A. and L.R. Act 1950 (Annexure No.7 to the writ petition)."

4. Facts in brief as contained in the writ petition are that the Land Management Committee of the Gaon Sabha namely Biraudi Tajpur Tehsil Sikandarabad, District Bulandshahar passed a unanimous resolution on 20-04-1994, whereby an agricultural lease was granted in favour of various persons including the present petitioners. The aforesaid resolution was duly

approved by the then Deputy Collector/Sub Divisional Officer vide order dated 12-5-1994. The private respondents namely Respondents Nos. 4 to 33 moved an application dated 29-06-1994 under sub section (4) of Section 198 of Uttar Pradesh Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms Act, 1950 (hereinafter to be referred as "Act 1950"), before the Collector, Bulandshahar.

5. On the basis of the aforesaid application, 2 cases were registered under Sub section (4) of Section 198 of the Act 1950, being Case No.17 of 2013, Computer Case No.D2013111700177, (Brahm Singh and Another vs. Kamal Singh and Others) and Case No. 21 of 2013, Computer Case No. D20131117001146, (Ravindra Singh and Another vs. Harbhajan Singh and Others).

6. In the aforesaid proceedings, a report was submitted by the concerned Sub Divisional Officer before the District Collector, Bulandshahar on 15-07-1994. In the aforesaid report the allegations were made to the effect that so called resolution was not carried out properly. In the aforesaid cases Petitioners submitted their Written Statements on 23-03-1995 whereby and whereunder they vehemently refuted the allegation as contained in the application in question. The aforesaid application was allowed by the Additional District Magistrate (Administration) vide its order dated 18-07-1995.

7. Aggrieved against the aforesaid, some of the petitioners filed a Revision before the Commissioner, Bulandshahar which was allowed vide order dated 9-12-1997. The aforesaid order was challenged by the complainant/Private respondents before the Board of Revenue and ultimately the Revision of the complainant was dismissed vide order dated 19-10-2001 passed by the Board of Revenue U.P. at Allahabad.

8. Aggrieved against the aforesaid, the private respondents approached this Court by filing two writ petitions namely Writ B No.40986 of 2001 (Brahm singh v Board of Revenue, UP Alld. and others) and Writ B No.40983 of 2001 (Fateh Mohd. vs. Board of Revenue U.P. at Alld. and Others). Both the writ petitions were clubbed together and finally decided by the Coordinate Bench of this court vide judgement and order dated 03-09-2012. Order reads as follows:

"Heard Sri R.B. Singhal learned Senior Counsel assisted by Sri A.B. Singhal learned counsel for the petitioner Sri M.C. Singh for respondent nos. 5, 29 and 30 and learned Standing Counsel for respondent nos. 1 and 2 as also learned counsel for the Gaon Sabha.

According to Sri R.B. Singhal learned counsel for the petitioner under the order dated 9.12.1997 in Revision no. 126 of 1995 (Harbhajan Singh and others Vs Ravindra Singh and others) connected with Revision no. 127 of 1997 (Kanwal Singh Vs Brahm Singh and others) the Additional Commissioner has set aside the order dated 18.7.1995 of the Additional Collector solely on the ground that the principles of natural justice were violated and that the Gaon Sabha which is a necessary party was not impleaded in proceedings under Section 198 (4) of the U.P. Zamindari Abolition & Land Reforms Act (herein after referred to as the Act).

Learned counsel states that the petitioner feeling aggrieved filed Revision no. 22 of 1997-98 and 23 of 1997-98 (Brahm Singh Vs Kanwal Singh) before the Board of Revenue wherein by the impugned order dated 19.10.2001 the revision of the petitioner has been rejected on two grounds. According to Sri Singhal the first ground taken by the Board of Revenue was that the Additional Collector cannot exercise the power or jurisdiction of a Collector in proceedings under Section 198 (4) of the Act and the second was that the Board of Revenue has affirmed the order passed by the Additional Commissioner on the question of violation of principles of natural justice.

According to Sri Singhal in case there is violation of principles of natural justice and such an order is set aside then the matter ought to have been remanded to the authority to reconsider the matter under Section 198 (4) of the Act.

Learned Standing Counsel and learned counsel for the Gaon Sabha and Sri M.C. Singh learned counsel for the contesting respondents have justified the impugned order and state that there was gross violation of principles of natural justice and hence the order of the Additional Collector was rightly set aside by the Additional Commissioner and revision filed by the petitioner was rightly rejected by the Board of Revenue. He states that insofar as the merits of the matter is concerned a

concurrent finding of fact has been recorded that there was violation of principles of natural justice and hence the impugned order should not be interfered with.

Having considered the submission of learned counsel for the parties and perused the record clearly the observation of the Board of Revenue that the Additional Collector cannot exercise the power and jurisdiction of the Collector in proceedings under Section 198 (4) of the Act is erroneous in view of the Full Bench decision dated 29.04.2008 passed on a reference made in this writ petition reported in 2008 (105) RD 1 as such the aforesaid view taken by the Board of Revenue being illegal is set aside.

Insofar as the concurrent findings of fact recorded by the Additional Commissioner and the Board of Revenue on the issue of violation of principles of natural justice is concerned they are concurrent findings of fact and there is nothing on record of this writ petition to indicate that the principles of natural justice were not violated by the Additional Collector. Clearly the Gaon Sabha was a necessary party which was not made a party and the respondents before the Additional Collector were not heard. As such the order was exparte.

However while not interfering in the concurrent findings of fact recorded therein it appears that when there was violation of principles of natural justice and the order of the Additional Collector required to be set aside the matter ought to have been remanded by the Additional Commissioner and the Board of Revenue to the Additional Collector for re-deciding the matter in accordance with law after giving opportunity of hearing to the parties. As such no interference is required in the impugned orders where findings of fact have been recorded regarding violation of principles of natural justice.

However, this writ petition is finally disposed of by providing that the matter stands remanded to the Additional Collector to proceed in the application under Section 198 (4) of the Act in accordance with law.

No order is passed as to costs. "

9. By the aforesaid order the matter was remanded to the Additional

Collector to proceed in the application under sub section (4) of section 198 of the Act, 1950 in accordance with Law. After remand of the matter, the concerned Gaon Sabha submitted its Written statement on 27-03-2015. In the aforesaid Written Statement the Gaon Sabha clearly refuted the allegations contained in the complaint.

10. Subsequently an order dated 30-06-2016 was passed by the Respondent no. 2/ Additional Collector (Administration), Bulandshahar, by which land which was allotted in favour of the petitioners dated 20-04-1994 as well as its approval order passed by the Deputy Collector/SDO dated 12-05-1994 were cancelled.

11. Aggrieved against the aforesaid, the Petitioners have preferred as many as 4 Revisions before the Commissioner, Meerut Division, Meerut, which was subsequently transferred to the Court of Additional Commissioner (Judicial-Ist), Meerut Division, Meerut under Section 333 of the Act, 1950, which was numbered as Revision No.125 of 2015 (Satish and Others vs. Jaipal and Others), Revision No.126 of 2015 (Harbhajan and Others vs. Ramgopal and Others), Revision No.117 of 2015 (Ikram and Others vs. Ravindra and Others) and Revision No.116 of 2015 (Kanwal Singh and Others vs. Raghuraj and Others). The aforesaid Revisions were clubbed together and Revision No.125 of 2015 (Satish and Others vs. Jaipal and Others) was treated as a leading Revision. The aforesaid revisions were dismissed by the Respondent no. 1 namely Additional Commissioner, Meerut Division, Meerut vide its order dated 3-10-2016.

12. Aggrieved against the aforesaid, the petitioners have preferred the present writ petition. The Writ Petition was duly entertained and interim order of status quo has been passed by this Court in favour of the Petitioners on 23-12-2016.

13. It is argued by the counsel for the Petitioners that the allotment of the land was made in favour of near and dear of the Pradhan of the Gaon sabha is absolutely false and incorrect and in this regard Written statement filed by the Gaon Sabha dated 27-03-2015 has not at all been taken into consideration. It is further argued that though various grounds were taken in the memo of Revision but not a single ground was taken into consideration by the Respondent no.1 while dismissing the aforesaid Revision. Hence, the

Revisional Court clearly committed an error of law in proceedings with the matter and dismissing the Revisions by non-speaking order. It is further argued that complainant has not stated anywhere in their complaint that they stood on higher preferential category in respect to the Petitioners and this was sine qua non for maintaining the application under section 198(4) of the Act 1950 and as such in the absence of the same application was liable to be rejected but this aspect of the matter has not been taken into consideration by the court below.

14. It is further argued that the court below relied upon the report dated 15-07-1994 submitted by the concerned Sub Divisional Officer, Sikandarabad but copy of the aforesaid report has never been provided to the petitioners. It is further argued that the entire matter was remanded back vide order dated 03-09-2012 by this Court in Writ B No.40986 of 2001 (Brahm Singh vs. Board of Revenue U.P. at Allahabad and Others), and in such contingencies it was incumbent upon the respondent no.2 to have record a fresh finding qua denovo enquiry as the earlier orders were already set aside by the concerned Commissioner and which has also been affirmed by the Board of Revenue U.P. at Allahabad and those findings of concerned Revisional Court qua court of Additional Commissioner as well as Board of Revenue U.P. at Allahabad was not entirely upset by the Hon'ble court in Writ B No.40986 of 2001 (Brahm Singh vs. Board of Revenue U.P. at Allahabad and Others), and such being the position then it was legally mandatory for the Respondent No.2 to have carried out fresh exercise for proceeding further and admissible evidence but this salutary exercise was not adhered by the respondent no.2 and accordingly it manifested grave error of law apparent on record.

15. It is further argued that as per sub Section (4) of Section 198 of the Act, 1950 proceedings could only be initiated either suo motu by the Collector or on the application of any "Aggrieved Person" by a allotment of land. It is further argued that insofar as the present case is concerned nothing has been stated in the complaint made by the private respondents that they are the 'aggrieved person'. It is further argued that though this aspect of the matter has been duly raised by the petitioners before the Revisional Authority and though the same was also duly taken note, but the same was not decided in a proper manner. Hence, the orders which are under challenged are liable to be

quashed.

16. On the other hand it is argued by the learned Standing Counsel, Counsel appearing on behalf of Gaon Sabha as well as counsel for the private-respondents that after looking into the entire aspect of the matter and going through the records, impugned orders were passed by the Authorities which does not call for any interference by this court under Article 226 of the Constitution of the India. It is further argued that since large number of irregularities were committed at the time of allotment of land, the resolution of allotment of Land dated 20.04.1994 and approval order dated 12.05.1994 were rightly cancelled.

17. Heard counsel for the parties and perused the record.

18. From perusal of the record, it transpires that the complaint was made by the Private Respondents against the Petitioners under Sub Section (4) of Section 198 of the Act, 1950. A complete procedure has been provided under the aforesaid Section which reads as follows:-

***Section 198(4)** "[The [Collector] [Substituted by U.P. Act No. 20 of 1982 (w.e.f. 18.08.1980).] may of his own motion and shall on the application of any person aggrieved by an allotment of land inquire in the manner prescribed into such allotment and if he is satisfied that the allotment is irregular, he may cancel the allotment and the lease, if any."*

19. From the bare reading of the said provisions, the position which emerged out that the Collector may of his own motion or on an application of any person aggrieved initiate a proceeding in respect to grant of patta, thus, if any person who moves an application for cancellation of patta which is granted in favour of another person then he has to satisfy that whether he comes within the ambit and scope of person aggrieved in order to enable him to initiate the proceedings for cancellation of patta.

20. In the present case, the ground taken by the private-respondent for initiating a proceeding under section 198(4) of the Act that they are resident of the said village by virtue of the same, they did not fall within the ambit and scope of the word "person aggrieved" rather they are strangers.

21. It is a settled legal proposition that a stranger cannot be permitted to

meddle in any proceeding, unless he satisfies the Authority/Court, that he falls within the category of aggrieved person. Any person means only a person who has suffered, or suffers from legal injury can challenge the act/action/order etc. in a Court of law. A writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution is maintainable either for the purpose of enforcing a statutory or legal right, or when there is a complaint by the appellant that there has been a breach of statutory duty on the part of the Authorities. Therefore, there must be a judicially enforceable right available for enforcement, on the basis of which writ jurisdiction is resorted to.

22. From perusal of the aforesaid it is clear that the complaint filed under sub section (4) of Section 198 of the Act, 1950 could only be decided either by suo motu by the Collector or on the complaint made by the 'person aggrieved'. Nothing has been stated in the entire writ petition nor any argument has been raised that the complainant stood on higher preferential category in respect to the Petitioners and this was sine qua non for maintaining the application under section 198(4) of the Act, 1950 and as such in the absence of the same application is liable to be rejected.

23. In **Ram Kumar vs. State of U.P. and Others** reported in **2017 (134) RD 428**, definition as well as the scope of the term "Aggrieved Person" as per Section 198 of the Act was briefly discussed. One who moves an application has to satisfy the mandate of being an aggrieved person. Merely by virtue of being a resident of the village one cannot be said to be falling within the scope of an aggrieved person, reinforcing the settled legal proposition that a stranger to the suit cannot be said to be person aggrieved. Further, "Person aggrieved" does not include a person who suffers from psychological or imaginary injury. Paragraph Nos.10, 11, 12 and 14 of the aforesaid Judgment passed in the case of **Ram Kumar (Supra)** is reproduced below:

10. Thus, if any person who moves an application for cancellation of patta which is granted in favour of another person then he has to satisfy that whether he comes within the ambit and scope of person aggrieved in order to enable him to initiate the proceedings for cancellation of patta.

11. In the present case, the ground taken by the petitioner for initiating a proceeding under section 198(4) of the Act that he is resident of the said

village by virtue of the same, he does not come within the ambit and scope of the word "person aggrieved" rather he is a stranger person.

12. It is a settled legal proposition that a stranger cannot be permitted to meddle in any proceeding, unless he satisfies the Authority/Court, that he falls within the category of aggrieved person.

14. Further, a "legal right", means an entitlement arising out of legal rules. Thus, it may be defined as an advantage, or a benefit conferred upon a person by the rule of law. The expression, "person aggrieved" does not include a person who suffers from a psychological or an imaginary injury; a person aggrieved must therefore, necessarily be one, whose right or interest has been adversely affected or jeopardised.

24. In the case of **Kanhai and Others vs. State of U.P. and Ors.** reported in **212 (4) ADJ 767** It was held that, a person who seeks to question the allotment has to show that he has a preferential right for the said allotment. Seeking cancellation of allotment order without showing preference cannot be questioned except on the intervention of the Gaon Sabha. Thus, having failed to disclose their right to possess the land, respondents could not be said to have any locus to question the order. Relevant para reads as follows:-

5. The Gaon Sabha has competence to allot the said land in terms of Section 198 of the UPZA & LR Act to class of persons defined therein. While making allotment provision of Section 198 of the Act are required to be complied with. Section 198 of the Act stipulates allotment to be made on the basis of preference to be given to a particular Class. A person who seeks to question the allotment has to show that he had preferential right for the said allotment. Seeking cancellation of allotment order without showing preference cannot be questioned except on the intervention of the Gaon Sabha. Petitioner claims that the land has been wrongly allotted to the respondents without claiming that they have right to seek allotment of the said land under the Act.

6. Rules with regard to locus standi is that judicial redress is available only to a person who has suffered a legal injury by reason of violation of his legal right or legal protected interest by the impugned action of the State or a public authority. Aggrieved person must show that he had suffered a legal grievance against whom a decision which has been pronounced which has wrongfully refused him of something, which he

had a right to demand. It is within this precincts that the aggrieved person can seek redressal of his grievance under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

25. Similarly in the case of **Hari Shankar Kushwaha and Ors. vs. State of U.P. and Ors.** Reported in **2018 (139) RD 521**, it was emphasized that only a person aggrieved be allowed to challenge the patta. Revevant portion of the judgment reads as follows:-

*5. Who is a person aggrieved was a subject matter of judicial interpretation in **Adi Pheroze Shah Gandhi v. H.M. Seervai** MANU/SC/0044/1970 : AIR 1971 SC 385. The Hon'ble Apex Court had said:- "From these cases it is apparent that any person who feels disappointed with the result of the case is not a person aggrieved. He must be disappointed of a benefit which he would have received if the order had gone the other way. The order must cause him a legal grievance by wrongfully depriving him of something."*

*6. From the above, it is clear that a person can be said to be aggrieved only when his rights are affected because of the existence of the patta, meaning thereby that if the patta goes then he would either continue to remain in possession or come into possession and thereafter till the land. The expression " person aggrieved" was also explained in **Pyare Lal v. Deputy Director of Consolidation, Mainpuri Camp at Etah and others** MANU/UP/0991/2004 : 2005 (98) RD 106, wherein this Court had held that only if a person who was aggrieved had sought to get a patta cancelled would the Collector initiate proceedings. In the instant case, the complainants were not persons aggrieved and, therefore, the very fact that the complaint was not filed by a person who was eligible to file the complaint would make the impugned orders unsustainable in law. After it has been found that the complaint itself was not maintainable nothing further ought to be looked into. However, since the Collector/Assistant Collector himself was required to make the enquiry and he did not make the enquiry himself, I also hold that orders were bad on account of the fact that the Collector/Assistant Collector himself did not make the enquiry.*

26. It is settled law that a person who suffers from legal injury only can challenge the act/action/order etc. by filing a writ petition. Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution is maintainable for enforcing a statutory or legal right or when there is a complaint by the petitioner that there is a breach of the statutory duty on the part of the authorities. Therefore, there must be a judicially enforceable right for the enforcement of which the writ jurisdiction can be resorted to. The Court can enforce the performance of a statutory duty by public bodies through its writ jurisdiction at the behest of a person, provided such person satisfies the Court that he has a legal right to insist on such performance. The existence of the said right is the condition precedent to invoke the writ jurisdiction. [**Utkal University etc. Vs. Dr. Nrusingha Charan Sarangi and others (AIR 1999 SC 943) and Laxminarayan R. Bhattad and others vs. State of Maharashtra and another (2003) 5 SCC 413**].

27. Legal right is an averment of entitlement arising out of law. It is, in fact, an advantage or benefit conferred upon a person by a rule of law [**Shanti Kumar R. Canji vs. Home Insurance Co. of New York (AIR 1974 SC 1719) and State of Rajasthan v. Union of India and others (AIR 1977 SC 1361)**].

28. In **Jasbhai Motibhai Desai v. Roshan Kumar Hazi Bashir Ahmad and others [AIR 1976 SC 578]**, the Hon'ble Apex Court has held that only a person who is aggrieved by an order, can maintain a writ petition. The expression 'aggrieved person' has been explained by the Apex Court observing that such a person must show that he has a more particular or peculiar interest of his own beyond that of the general public in seeing that the law is properly administered. In the said case, a cinema hall owner had challenged the sanction of setting up of a rival cinema hall in the town contending that it would adversely affect monopolistic commercial interest, causing pecuniary harm and loss of business from competition. The Hon'ble Apex Court observed as under:-

*"Such harm or loss is not wrongful in the eye of law because it does not result in injury to a legal right or a legally protected interest, the business competition causing it being a lawful activity. Judicially, harm of this description is called *damnum sine injuria*. The term *injuria* being here*

used in its true sense reason why law suffers a person knowingly to inflict harm of this description on another, without holding him accountable for it, is that such harm done to an individual is a gain to society at large. In the light of the above discussion, it is demonstratively clear that the appellant has not been denied or deprived of a legal right. He has not sustained injury to any legally protected interest. In fact, the impugned order does not operate as a decision against him, much less does it wrongfully effect his title to something. He has not been subjected to legal wrong. He has suffered no grievance. He has no legal peg for a justiciable claim to hand on. Therefore, he is not a "person aggrieved" to challenge the ground of the no objection certificate. (see Babua Ram and others Vs. State of U.P. and another (1995) 2 SCC 689 and Northern Plastics Ltd. Vs. Hindustan Photo Films Mfg. Co. Ltd. and others (1997) 4SCC 452) and a decision given by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of Dharam Raj Vs. State of U.P. and others, 2009 (27) LCD 1373".

29. In Collin's English Dictionary, the word "aggrieved" has been defined to mean "to ensure unjustly especially by infringing a person's legal rights". In Webster Comprehensive Dictionary, International Edition at page 28, 'aggrieved person' is defined to mean "subjected to ill-treatment, feeling an injury or injustice. Injured, as by legal decision adversely infringing upon one's rights". In Stroud's Judicial Dictionary, Fifth Ed., Vol. 1, pages 83-84, person aggrieved means "person injured or damaged in a legal sense".

30. In Black's Law Dictionary, Sixth Ed. at page 65, aggrieved has been defined to mean "having suffered loss or injury; damnified; injured", aggrieved person has been defined to mean:

"One whose legal right is invaded by an act complained of, or whose pecuniary interest is directly and adversely affected by a decree or judgment. One whose right of property may be established or divested. The word "aggrieved" refers to a substantial grievance, a denial of some personal, pecuniary or property right, or the imposition upon a party of a burden or obligation."

31. Thus, the person aggrieved is, therefore, in this context, would mean a person who had suffered legal injury or one who has been unjustly deprived

or denied of something.

32. From perusal of the facts as narrated above and also for the arguments as has been raised by the counsel for the respondents it is clear that complainants who moved application under Section 198(4) of the Act, 1950 against the petitioners does not fall within the definition of person aggrieved.

33. In this view of the matter, the Court is of the opinion that the order dated 03.10.2016 passed by the Respondent No.1 namely Additional Commissioner, Meerut Division, Meerut as well as order dated 30.06.2016 passed by the Respondent No.2 namely Additional Collector/ A.D.M., (Administration), Bulandshahar are liable to be set aside and are hereby quashed.

34. The writ petition is **allowed**. No order as to costs.

(Prakash Padia,J.)

February 20, 2026

Swati