

LPA no. 1694 of 2016 (O&M) 1

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

LPA no. 1694 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 05.09.2016

Baljeet Singh Saini and others

....Appellant(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent(s)

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHESH GROVER
HON'BLE MR JUSTICE DR. SHEKHER DHAWAN**

Present : Mr. S.K.Sharma, Advocate for the appellants

MAHESH GROVER, J.

The appellants impugn the judgment of the learned Single Judge dated 4.8.2016.

Pursuant to the orders passed by the Director General of Industries and Commerce cum Registrar (General) Societies Haryana a public notice was inserted. We may for the purposes of reference reproduce the relevant portion of the order of the said authority:-

“6. Keeping the aforesaid in view, I do not find any infirmity and hereby order to upload the impugned order of the State Registrar dated 18.12.2014. The administrator of the society is directed to invite freshly the objections/applications/additions to the voter list through two highly circulated leading daily newspapers in Hindi/Vernacular language and the schedule of the election should not be delayed beyond three months. It is also directed that the administrator will prepare the bio metric identity cards of the members of the

society linking with the original Aadhar card and ensure that no false identity cards of the members are made.”

In the public notice it was stated that those 4600 life members having biometric cards need not apply. The appellants presume this to be an affirmation of rights of these 4600 members.

Learned Single Judge notice that the public notice which was challenged before the writ Court merely indicated that a verification drive to establish members of the society was in progress and because 4600 life members were already having biometric cards they were exempted from applying afresh. This as a language of the notice suggests is the only intent and nothing more can be read into it. Learned Single Judge was right in dismissing the writ petition as the verification drive would evidently be confined to all those persons to apply with biometric identities including those 4600 who already had such biometric identities.

No ground to interfere is made out.

Hence, dismissed.

(Mahesh Grover)
Judge

(Shekher Dhawan)
Judge

05.09.2016

rekha

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No