

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.23742 of 2015
Date of Decision: November 05, 2015

Rahemati and othersPetitioners

versus

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT.
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P.B.BAJANTHRI.

Present: Mr.Yashpal Thakur, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr.Anil Mehta, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

-.-

1. *Whether Reporters of Local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporters or not?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Surya Kant, J. (Oral)

Notice of motion to respondent Nos.1 to 4 only at
this stage.

On our asking, Mr.Anil Mehta, learned Deputy
Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on their behalf.

Let four copies of the writ petition be supplied to
the State counsel during the course of day failing which this
order shall be automatically recalled and the writ petition shall
be deemed to have been dismissed for non-prosecution.

In view of the nature of order which we propose to
pass, we are not inclined to issue notice to private-respondent
Nos.6 to 10 as no order prejudicial to their interest is being
passed, nor any counter-reply from respondent Nos.1 to 4 is
required at this stage.

The petitioners are residents of village Lakhnaka, Tehsil Hathin, District Palwal. It appears that revised electoral rolls of their village were notified on 22.07.2015; objections were invited; those objections were considered and then revised the voter list was published on 19.09.2015. The grievance of the petitioners is that while issuing the revised voter list, 86 out of 250 disputed voters have been included but the petitioners are still left out from inclusion in that voter list. They thus seek a direction for their inclusion in the revised voter list. They further allege that the private-respondents are neither the bonafide residents of their village and some of them being minor cannot even have a right to franchise.

We do not express any views on the merits of both the claims. Suffice it would be to observe that such like disputed questions are to be determined by the District Election Officer-cum-Deputy Commissioner. We thus, dispose of this writ petition with a direction to the 2nd respondent to treat this petition as a fresh representation on behalf of the petitioners and take appropriate decision in accordance with law and principles of natural justice, well before the Gram Panchayat elections are held.

Ordered accordingly.

Dasti.

[SURYA KANT]
JUDGE

November 05, 2015
mohinder

[P.B.BAJANTHRI]
JUDGE