

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

Date of Decision : 10.2.2021

219

CWP-1622-2021 (O&M)

Harvinder Kaur Gill and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

222

CWP-2800-2021 (O&M)

Bhaskar Nokwal and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI
: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ**

Present : Mr. Anand Chhibar, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Lalit Thakur, Advocate
for the petitioners in CWP-2800-2021.

Mr. H.S.Brar, Advocate
for the petitioners in CWP-1622-2021.

Mr. Suveer Sheokhand, Addl. A.G, Punjab.

Mr. S.P.S.Tinna, Advocate
for respondent No.6.

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

1. By this common order we shall disposed of above-said writ petitions as the same questions of law and facts are involved therein.

2. These two writ petitions have been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents No. 2 to 4 for video recording the nomination process including the scrutiny of election of the concerned

Municipal Corporation as well as the video recording outside the polling

booth on the day of polling.

3. Notice of motion in CWP-2800-2021.

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Suveer Sheokhand, Addl. A.G, Punjab and Mr. SPS Tinna, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the State/respondents No. 1 to 5 and respondents No.6 respectively.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners in both the writ petitions have restricted their claim to the extent that videography should be conducted of the poll from outside to ensure fair and free poll so that no intimidation etc. takes place.

6. Short synopsis/status report dated 6.2.2021 in the shape of short affidavit of Sandeep Hans, IAS, Deputy Commissioner, Moga has been filed on behalf of respondents No. 2 and 3 in CWP-1622-2021, the same is taken on record. Para No.6 of the said reply is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“6) That in case any request for the video recording outside the polling booth on the day of poll be received from any candidates, then the same would be considered as per directions/guidelines of the State Election Commission.”

7. Learned State counsel and counsel for respondent No.6 state that this reply would suffice in the writ petition in CWP-2800-2021 also.

8. Learned Senior counsel as well as counsel for the petitioner in connected petition state that they would move application in case the situation so warrants. In view of para 6 of the reply, we have been ensured that if such application is moved the Election Commission would decide the same in accordance with law.

10. Petitions stand disposed of accordingly.

11. Since the main cases have been decided, the pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**

**(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE**

**February 10, 2021
anuradha**

Whether speaking/reasoned	-	Yes/No
Whether reportable	-	Yes/No