



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 1017 of 2025

Amit Verma

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Home Deptt. Lko.
And 6 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Apoorva Tewari
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 1

**HON'BLE RAJAN ROY, J.
HON'BLE PRASHANT KUMAR, J.**

1. Shri Ashish Chaturvedi, raises a preliminary objection that the petition is a proxy petition actuated by political considerations.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner says that the argument is absolutely baseless as there is no such political motive.
3. Be that as it may without going into this question as to whether the petitioner has filed this petition actuated by political motive or not, considering the importance of the issue as, often we find that petitions come up before this Court either for installation of a statue or for removal of existing statue built on public land, and in this case the allegation is that statue of one Mr. Indrabhadra Singh, Ex-MLA has been installed on a land belonging to the Government, therefore, in view of the above, we direct the registry to register a suo moto Public Interest Litigation titled In Re: *"Installation of Statue etc. on Public Land, and Their Removal"* and we discharge the petitioner from the duty of pursuing these proceedings any further. The opposite parties herein shall continue to remain the opposite parties in these proceedings.
4. We may in this context refer to two Government Orders which are on record, one is dated 16.05.1997 and the other is dated 23.09.2008. We may also in this context refer to judgement and order passed by the Hon'ble the Supreme Court in SLP (C) No. 851 of 2006 (Union of India

and others vs. State of Gujarat and others) copies of which are on record, which enjoin upon the High Court to implement the directions issued by Hon'ble the Supreme Court. We will consider these issues further on the next date.

5. List on 29.10.2025, as fresh.

6. The opposite party nos. 1, 2, 3, and 5 shall file their separate affidavit, keeping in mind the averments made in this very writ petition which shall now proceed as a suo motu proceeding and before filing counter affidavit, they should conduct an inquiry as to the land on which the statue as alleged has been constructed, whether it is Government land, if so, could a statue have been installed therein, if not, then what is the procedure to be followed for removing the statue or resolving the issue. Opposite party no. 7 who is already represented by Shri Dharendra Kumar Mishra, shall also file his affidavit accordingly.

(Prashant Kumar,J.) (Rajan Roy,J.)

September 25, 2025
Bhanu



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 1017 of 2025

Amit Verma

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Home Deptt. Lko.
And 6 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Apoorva Tewari
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Dhirendra Kumar Mishra

Court No. - 1

**HON'BLE RAJAN ROY, J.
HON'BLE RAJEEV BHARTI, J.**

1. In spite of our order dated 25.09.2025, the suo motu PIL as was ordered has not been registered nor is it shown in the cause list instead the same petition has been placed before the Court.
2. Let the Office submit an explanation as to why this non-compliance and why action be not initiated against the concerned officials, who it seems, do not even bother to go through the orders passed by the Division Bench what to say of complying it.
3. The Senior Registrar shall submit his report in the matter in a sealed cover.
4. Put up this case day after tomorrow, i.e. **31.10.2025 as fresh.**

(Rajeev Bharti,J.) (Rajan Roy,J.)

October 29, 2025

Anand/-



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 1017 of 2025

In Re Installation Of Statue Etc. On Public Land
And Their Removal

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin. Secy. Home Deptt. Lko.
And 6 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Dhirendra Kumar Mishra

Court No. - 1

**HON'BLE RAJAN ROY, J.
HON'BLE RAJEEV BHARTI, J.**

Affidavit on behalf of opposite party no.1 and counter affidavits on behalf of opposite party nos.2 and 3 have been filed today which are taken on record.

Heard.

We have perused the report of Senior Registrar in sealed cover in response to our order dated 29.10.2025. The report of Senior Registrar is accepted.

Let the office implead Nagar Palika, Sultanpur through its Executive Officer as an opposite party during course of the day. Notice of these proceedings be given to learned Standing Counsel for Nagar Palika, Sultanpur as it is stated in the affidavits filed today on behalf of the State officials that Nagar Palika has got two statues constructed on P.W.D. road/ land.

Affidavit of District Magistrate is however silent as to what is the procedure for removing the statues from government land if it has been installed illegally.

Let a supplementary affidavit be filed by the District Magistrate. The Executive Officer of the Nagar Palika, Sultanpur should also file an

affidavit as to under what circumstances the aforesaid two statues referred in the affidavit of the District Magistrate, Sultanpur were installed by it, if it is so. If not, then a specific averment be made in this regard in his affidavit and what does the Nagar Palika propose to do in this regard if statues have been installed on government land or road, illegally.

Opposite party no.7 has not filed counter affidavit as yet. He may do so.

This matter shall now come up on **25.11.2025 as fresh.**

The report of Senior Registrar is kept on record.

(Rajeev Bharti,J.) (Rajan Roy,J.)

October 31, 2025

Shanu/-