



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 383 of 2025

Suo Motu in the matter of creation of 9149 Courts

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of U.P. through Principal Secretary Law

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Suo Motu, Vijay Dixit
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: Sudeep Kumar, A.A.G., Shailendra Kumar Singh C.S.C., Vivek Shukla, A.C.S.C., Gaurav Mehrotra,

Chief Justice's Court

**HON'BLE ARUN BHANSALI, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE JASPREET SINGH, J.**

1. Learned counsel for the High Court has placed on record the entire set of communications since passing of the order by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Imtiyaz Ahmad v. State of U.P. and others : (2017) 3 SCC 658** i.e. 02.01.2017, which is taken on record.
2. The issue pertaining to the creation of Courts is pending consideration in the present petition registered as Suo Motu PIL since passing of the first order dated 21.04.2025 by this Court. Repeatedly thereafter the matter is being taken up by the Court. Various affidavits have been filed, orders passed and officers called to remain present before the Court and on prayer being made, time granted for doing the needful.
3. By order dated 13.04.2026 after taking note of the entire sequence of events, again time was granted for doing the needful and it was directed that if a final decision is not taken by the next date of listing, Legal Remembrancer (LR) shall again appear in person before the Court on the next date of listing.
4. Today, when the matter has come up before the Court, the Legal Remembrancer (LR) is present in person.
5. Learned Additional Advocate General, on instructions, has submitted that so far as whatever needs to be done on the part of Legal

Remembrancer (LR) is concerned, entire exercise has been undertaken for creation of 900 Courts, however, now a query has been put as to why only 900 Courts and why not 2693 Courts be created.

6. It is surprising that despite the fact that for over a long period, even 900 Courts are not being created and queries one after the other, which are baseless (as noticed in order dated 13.04.2026), are being raised and now it is being sought to be questioned as to why not 2693 Courts instead of 900 Courts be created, the attempt appears only to delay the creation of even 900 Courts, which attempt cannot be countenanced.

7. Learned Additional Advocate General made an earnest prayer that one more opportunity may be granted to ensure that needful, based on the previous orders, is done at the appropriate level.

8. Though the fact is that the respondents, apparently, only want time for no justifiable reasons, in view of the nature of prayer made by learned Additional Advocate General, one last opportunity is granted to do the needful by the next date.

9. List the petition on 08.07.2026, as fresh.

10. In case, the final decision is not taken by the next date, the Chief Secretary of the State along with the Legal Remembrancer (LR) shall remain present before the Court on the next date.

(Jaspreet Singh,J.) (Arun Bhansali,CJ.)

May 19, 2026
Sandeep/Rakesh