

Government of UP

Industrial Development Department; Section -4

No.835/ 77-4-25/83 Appeal/23

Lucknow: Dated 17.02.2026

Gorakh Nand Yadav

..... Revisionist

Vs

Gorakhpur Industrial Development Authority(GIDA) Respondent

The present revision petition has been filed on behalf of Sri Gorakh Nand Yadav challenging the decision of the Respondent Authority allocating Plot No K-48, sector-13 to one Sri Ram Vashishth Yadav whereas the same plot was allotted to the Revisionist in the list put-up by the Respondent Authority after the interview to the concerned applicants.

It has been averred by the revisionist that in passing the said order, no opportunity of hearing was given to the revisionist and that the order is *void ab initio* since it does not conform to the principles of natural justice. The Respondent authority confirmed that the said order has been passed by the CEO solely on the basis of records available with the Respondent Authority and in doing so no opportunity of hearing was accorded to either of the allottees. It has further been brought to the notice by GIDA that neither the Revisionist nor Sri Ram Vashishtha Yadav have deposited any of the instalments due to the Authority in lieu of the plot, save what was required to be deposited as the reservation money. Despite several notices, both plots at this point of time are vacant. As such, both allottees are in breach of the conditions of allotment and the allotments stands cancelled as at the time of hearing. The learned advocate on behalf of the Revisionist has contended that they are ready to deposit the amount of the original plot within six months' time and that even the initial reservation money deposited was under protest since the right plot number was not mentioned in the allotment letter. Sri Ram

Vashishtha Yadav was directed to be impleaded in the Revision Petition vide order dated 24.06.2025.

Heard Sri Gorakh Nand Yadav, Revisionist, present through VC. His advocate could not be present, an opportunity for written arguments for submitting written argument was accorded to the Revisionist. Sri Ram Vashishth Yadav attended the hearing in person. Smt Anuj Malik, CEO GIDA on behalf of Respondent Authority is present through VC.

The main bone of contention is with respect to allotment of two plots, one bearing the Plot No K48 Sector 13 and other bearing the No. D-1/9, Sector 15. The argument on behalf of the Revisionist is that in the list published after the interview process Plot No K-48, Sector 13 was shown against his name whereas the allotment letter issued to him was for the Plot No D-1/9, Sector-15 and that this change was affected unilaterally by CEO GIDA.

It was however contented both by CEO GIDA as well as by Sri Ram Vashishth Yadav that while applying, the Revisionist had applied for a plot in Sector-15 and not in Sector-13. The original application submitted before the Revisional Authority substantiates this claim that Sri Gorakh Nand Yadav applied for a 3000 sq.m. plot in **Sector-15**. On the other hand, Sri Ram Vashishth Yadav had applied for a plot in sector-13 and was allotted a plot as per his preference. There was an inadvertent error in the publication of the list after the interview, with plots having been erroneously interchanged; the allotment was reflected in Sector 15 when, in fact, he had applied for a plot in Sector 13.

It is a matter of record that the Revisionist had applied for a plot in Sector 15 whereas Sri Ram Vashishth Yadav applied for a plot in Sector 13. The allotment letters as issued to the respective parties reflect the same position. Therefore, the claim of the Revisionist that he gets an inalienable right on the plot in Sector 13 solely on account of the clerical error in the publication of the list of allotments cannot be sustained. The CEO of the Respondent Authority, after due consideration of the records had decided that

the allotment in fact reflect the request made by them in their respective applications. It is also not correct to state that the order of the CEO was void being violative of the principles of natural justice. This is so because each of the applicants was allocated a plot in the sector of their choice and the same was reflected in all official communications of the Respondent Authority with the respective allottees. The order of the CEO merely acknowledges and corrects the clerical error in the list published on the Authority's Notice Board and sets the record straight and does not prejudice the rights of either allottee; as such there was no need to accord an opportunity of hearing to the Revisionists. Moreover, neither of the allottees have been forthcoming in terms of following the conditionalities governing the letter of allotment. As such, entertaining a revision petition when the allottees are in consistent breach of allotment conditionalities would amount to bad faith and misuse of this quasi-judicial forum on the part of the revisionist.

Accordingly, I find that there is no need to interfere in the order passed by the Respondent Authority. Revision is dismissed accordingly.

Sd/-
(Alok Kumar)
Additional Chief Secretary

Letter No.835/77-4-25 /83 Appeal/23 Dated:

1. Chief Executive Officer, GIDA
2. Sri Gorakh Nand Yadav, Gorakhpur (Email: gkfoods15@gmail.com)
3. Sri R.V. Yadav (Email: rvgunjan256@gmail.com)
4. Director, I.T. Invest U.P. – to upload it on Department's website
5. Guard File.

By Order

(Nirmesh Kumar Shukla)
Joint Secretary