

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL No. _____ OF 2025
(Arising out of SLP(C) No.9386 OF 2024)

SATNAM SINGH

... APPELLANT

Versus

STATE OF U.P & ORS.

... RESPONDENTS

O R D E R

1. Leave granted.
2. Heard learned counsel for the parties and carefully perused the material placed on record.
3. The High Court, *vide* the impugned judgment, passed in a Public Interest Litigation, has *inter alia* directed the demolition of a Gram Panchayat Bhawan, which has been constructed over plot No.254 instead of plot No.102; and for which a resolution was subsequently passed.
4. It is not in dispute that the State Government released the grant-in-aid for construction of a Panchayat Bhawan and the construction thereof is already complete. The cause which has found favour with the High Court, and which seems to be correct to a limited extent, is that by constructing the Panchayat Bhawan at Plot No.254, some public passage has allegedly been blocked.

5. Learned counsel for the appellant, the then Sarpanch, however, states that an alternative passage with a wider width has been provided and, thus, no inconvenience or hardship is being caused to the residents of the village.

6. Having regard to the fact that public money has been spent in construction of the Panchayat Bhawan and that even the alternate site, where it has been finally constructed, also belongs to the Gram Panchayat, it seems that no useful purpose will be served by sustaining the order of its dismantling/demolition. Such an order would instead amount to sheer wastage of public money.

7. Therefore, taking into consideration the concern expressed by the High Court regarding blockage of the public passage, we direct the Collector of the District to visit the village and see that the alternative passage provided by the Gram Panchayat, and to ascertain whether the same is functional and meets with the prevailing requirements. In case it is found that the alternative passage is not workable, the Collector shall be at liberty to suggest any other alternative passage in consultation with the Panchayat and other authorities. It is clarified that such an alternative site must be workable without dismantling the Gram Panchayat Bhawan which has already been constructed. Ordered accordingly.

8. The appeal is allowed and the impugned judgment of the High Court stands modified to the aforesaid extent.

9. As a result, the pending interlocutory application also stands disposed of.

.....CJI.
(SURYA KANT)

.....J.
(JOYMALYA BAGCHI)

NEW DELHI;
DECEMBER 05, 2025.

ITEM NO.22

COURT NO.1

SECTION XI

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).9386/2024

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 04-03-2024 in PIL No.1419/2022 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Allahabad]

SATNAM SINGH

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF U.P & ORS.

Respondent(s)

[ONLY I.A. No.123969/2025 IS LISTED UNDER THIS ITEM]
IA No. 123969/2025 - APPROPRIATE ORDERS/DIRECTIONS

Date : 05-12-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.
CORAM :

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JOYMALYA BAGCHI

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Manoj K. Mishra, AOR
Mr. Umesh Dubey, Adv.
Ms. Madhulika, Adv.
Mr. Anand Kumar Rai, Adv.
Mr. Radeesh Kumar Mt, Adv.
Mr. Amulya Dev Mishra, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Tanmaya Agarwal, AOR
Mr. Wrick Chatterjee, Adv.
Mr. Sanjay Jain, Adv.
Mrs. Aditi Agarwal, Adv.

Mr. Sanjay Tyagi, AOR

Mr. Arjun Harkauli, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

Leave granted.

The appeal is allowed in terms of the signed order.

As a result, the pending interlocutory application also stands disposed of.

(SATISH KUMAR YADAV)
ADDITIONAL REGISTRAR

(PREETHI T.C.)
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

(signed order is placed on the file)

LawChakra.in