



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

WRIT - C No. - 7284 of 2026

Methodist Mission Girls Junior High School Civil
Lines Sitapur And Another

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin.Secy./ Addl. Chief Secy.
Govt., Deptt. Revenue Lko. And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	: Rohit Tripathi, Akarsh Asthana, Nida Navi
Counsel for Respondent(s)	: C.S.C.

In Chamber

**HON'BLE ALOK MATHUR, J.
HON'BLE AMITABH KUMAR RAI, J.**

1. Heard Sri Rohit Tripathi, learned counsel for the petitioners as well as Sri Nishant Shukla, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel for the State respondents and Sri Mohit Jauhari, learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 5.

2. This Bench has been constituted on the request made by learned counsel for the petitioners on the ground that there is urgency in the matter as there is eminent threat of demolition of the educational institution which is existing over the the disputed land over last 150 years.

3. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that the land on which the petitioner institution has been established has an area of 3.562 hectares situated in Village - Chavani Kadim, Pargana - Khairabad, Tehsil and District - Sitapur and same has been wrongly described as Nazool land in the records of the State Government, while infact the said land was purchased by the predecessor in interest of the petitioners in 1862 and was handed over to previous predecessor in interest of the petitioners and then it came into the hands of the petitioners who are running an educational institution over the same land.

4. It is submitted by learned Standing Counsel that the impugned order passed by the District Magistrate, Sitapur dated 24.06.2026, would clearly

indicate that they have not touched the area of the disputed land on which the educational activities are being conducted by the petitioners as well as the Church and have only re-claimed other areas, the description of which has been given in the impugned order itself. It is further submitted that certain demolition activities have been carried out and possession of the same has been taken by the Nagar Palika Parishad Sitapur on 10.07.2024.

5. It is noticed that there is mention of a civil suit being pending before Civil Judge (Senior Division), Sitapur being Suit No. 34 of 2017 with regard to the portion of the disputed property, but there is no mention/submission in this regard in the writ petition and learned counsel for the petitioners has fairly submitted that as the writ petition was drafted and filed in great urgency, certain facts have been left out from being brought on record.

6. In the light of above, list this case on 20.07.2026 in top ten cases.

7. Considering the fact that the State Government has already taken possession of the portion of the disputed land, it is directed that they shall not change the nature of the possessed disputed property and the parties shall maintain status quo over the said land till the next date of listing.

8. The office of learned Chief Standing Counsel is directed to communicate this order to the State authorities forthwith, without waiting for the certified copy of this order being issued.

(Amitabh Kumar Rai,J.) (Alok Mathur,J.)

July 12, 2026
A. Verma