

required to be reversed it can exercise the revisional power and there is no need for reference to the Board of Revenue. At the time when the revision was filed in the year 1992, the said revision was under Section 218 of the U. P. Land Revenue Act claiming exercise of power of reference. Section 10 of the U. P. Act No. XX of 1997 has only saved the reference which were already referred to the Board of Revenue on 18.8.1997. Thus, even if the reference was filed under Section 218 prior to 18.8.1997 in which no reference was made to the Board of Revenue, the same could not have been continued as the reference under Section 218. Now the Commissioner himself has been vested with the power of revisional jurisdiction under Section 219. In Revision No. 41 of 1992 which is pending before the Commissioner, there is no lack of Jurisdiction in the Commissioner to exercise his revisional jurisdiction. The exercise of jurisdiction now has to be made under Section 219 instead of Section 218. Merely because in the memo of revision Section 218 was mentioned earlier, it will not Inhibit the Commissioner in exercising his jurisdiction under Section 219 of the U. P. Land Revenue Act.”

13. It is also material to mention that no counter affidavit has been filed by State for the last more than 25 years, as such, there is no option except to decide the instant petition on the basis of averment made in the writ petition as mentioned above.

14. Considering the facts and circumstances, especially, the order dated 25.9.1986 passed by the Consolidation Officer in the title proceeding which has

attained finality, there is no illegality in the order passed by the Additional Commissioner dated 12.5.1998, accordingly, the impugned order dated 17.8.1998, passed by the respondent no.1/Board of Revenue is liable to be set aside and the same is hereby set aside.

15. The writ petition stands allowed and the order passed by the Additional Commissioner dated 12.5.1998 is hereby affirmed.

16. No order as to costs.

-----  
**(2025) 2 ILRA 524**  
**ORIGINAL JURISDICTION**  
**CIVIL SIDE**  
**DATED: ALLAHABAD 19.02.2025**

**BEFORE**

**THE HON'BLE SHEKHAR B. SARAF, J.**  
**THE HON'BLE VIPIN CHANDRA DIXIT, J.**

Writ C No. 3948 of 2025

<b>Rajneeta</b>		<b>...Petitioner</b>
	<b>Versus</b>	
<b>U.O.I. &amp; Ors.</b>		<b>...Respondents</b>

**Counsel for the Petitioner:**  
 Sri Mohammad Danish, Mohammad Iliyas

**Counsel for the Respondents:**  
 A.S.G.I., C.S.C., Sri Vivek Kumar Singh

**(A) Constitutional Law – Victim Compensation – Non-payment of additional compensation to acid attack victim – Prime Minister National Relief Fund – Executive Directions – Authorities required to fulfill their primary duty to serve the people, especially ones who have been disabled by egregious acts of violence – State Government directed to issue a circular to all the District Magistrates to ensure that delay of such nature is not repeated in future –**

**Lackadaisical approach - incompetency and lack of compassion - war footing – Authorities directed to ensure payment of additional compensation to acid attack victim within stipulated time. (Para -6,7, 8)**

Petitioner, a victim of acid attack in 2013 - received certain compensation but not the additional compensation of Rs.1,00,000/- payable under the Prime Minister National Relief Fund - Despite instructions from the Union of India, no response was given by the District Magistrate regarding the required proforma and documents. **(Para - 2 to 7)**

**HELD:** - Court directed the authorities to ensure prompt payment of additional compensation by the Union of India to the petitioner and mandated the State Government to issue a circular to all District Magistrates to prevent future delays. **(Para - 6 to 8)**

**Petition disposed of. (E-7)**

(Delivered by Hon'ble Shekhar B. Saraf, J.  
&  
Hon'ble Vipin Chandra Dixit, J.)

1. Heard Mohd. Iliyas, counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, Mr. Vivek Kumar Singh, counsel appearing on behalf of the Union of India and Mr. K.K. Singh, Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the State respondents.

2. In the present writ petition, the petitioner has been running from pillar to post for receiving the additional compensation of Rs.1,00,000/- payable to acid attack victims under the Prime Minister National Relief Fund.

3. Upon perusal of the documents, it appears that by a letter dated September 3, 2024, the Under Secretary, Government of India, Ministry of Home Affairs, Women Safety Division, New Delhi has

written to the District Magistrate, Meerut to provide specific responses in the enclosed proforma along with legible copy of the medical report and the first information report of the acid attack upon the petitioner and one more victim.

4. Counsel on behalf of the State respondents submits that he has no instructions in the matter.

5. It appears that in spite of letter written by the Union of India, no response has been sent by the District Magistrate, Meerut. We find the situation to be extremely alarming as the case is with regard to compensation to the victim of an acid attack.

6. It is to be noted that the incident of acid attack had taken place in the year 2013 and certain compensation was received by the petitioner. However, it is clear from the records that the cost of the surgeries and medical assistance required by the petitioner is far above the compensation provided to the petitioner. In light of the same, it becomes imperative to direct the authorities to ensure that the additional compensation to be provided by the Union of India should be handed over to the petitioner at the earliest.

7. The present lackadaisical approach of the District Magistrate, Meerut clearly indicates incompetency and lack of compassion. Authorities are required to fulfill their primary duty to serve the people, especially ones who have been disabled by egregious acts of violence as in the present case. We would expect far more alacrity and empathy to be shown by State officials. The State Government is, accordingly, directed to issue a circular to all the District Magistrates to ensure that

10. Let this order be also communicated by the Registrar (Compliance) of this Court to the Ministry of Home Affairs, Women Safety Division, Government of India, New Delhi and the District Magistrate, Meerut.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondents.