

## State Of Uttar Pradesh vs Bhupat And Ors. on 19 July, 1984

**Equivalent citations:** AIR1984SC1828, (1984)4SCC237, 1984(16)UJ1109(SC), AIR 1984 SUPREME COURT 1828, 1985 ALL. L. J. 248, (1985) IJR 31 (SC), 1984 UJ(SC) 1109, (1984) 2 RENTLR 701, 1984 (4) SCC 237, (1984) 10 ALL LR 686, (1984) 2 ALL RENTCAS 554

**Author:** D.A. Desai

**Bench:** D.A. Desai, V. Balakrishnan Eradi

ORDER

D.A. Desai, J.

1. This appeal arises from a judgment rendered by learned Single Judge of the Allahabad High Court in Writ Petition No. 1947 of 1968. In the writ petition, constitutional validity of U. P. Public Land (Eviction and Recovery of Rent and Damages) Act XIII of 1959 (U.P. Act for short) was questioned. The learned Judge following the decision of the Full Bench of the same High Court in Raja Ram Verma v. State that the provisions of the impugned Act were violative of Article 14 because it denied equality before law and was thus ultra vires the Constitution. Against the judgment of the High Court the State of U.P. has preferred this appeal by certificate.

2. Much water has flown across the Yamuna since the decision of the Allahabad High Court. In Maganlal Chhaganlal (P) Ltd. v. Municipal Corporation of Greater Bombay . Constitution Bench of seven Judges of this Court upheld the validity of various provisions of the Bombay Municipal Corporation Act 1888 which provided a different and a summary procedure for eviction from municipal premises. The impugned statute provided a different procedure and forum for recovering possession of the premises governed by it and the reasons which weighed with the Constitution Bench for upholding the validity of identical provisions of the Bombay Municipal Corporation Act would apply mutatis mutandis to the present case with the result that the judgment of the High Court cannot stand. Further in Jai Dutta v. State of U.P. constitutional validity of the U.P. Act was questioned. After referring to the decision in Maganlal Chhaganlal's case it was observed that the contention that the provisions of the impugned Act were violative of Article 14 no more survives and is concluded by the aforementioned decision. There was no alternative ground of attack. Therefore, in view of the above mentioned two decisions the challenge against the constitutionality of the impugned statute cannot be upheld and consequently the decision of the High Court has to be reversed. Accordingly this appeal is allowed and the judgment of the High Court is set aside and the writ petition of the respondent is dismissed with no order as to costs.