

2024:PHHC:128287



IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT
CHANDIGARH.

131

CWP-24452-2024 (O&M).
Date of Decision: 26.09.2024.

ANIL KUMAR AND OTHERS

... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.

Present: Mr. Vikram Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition is for directing the respondents No.2 and 3 to take action in a time bound manner in furtherance of “Requisition for Meeting’ given by the petitioners dated 06.09.2024 (Annexure P-6) for calling a meeting for consideration of Motion of No Confidence against the President of Zila Parishad, Rohtak by fixing a date and time for meeting in view of Section 129 of the Haryana Panchayati Raj Act, 1994.

2024:PHHC:128287



2 Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioners along with other elected members of Zila Parishad, Rohtak, had moved the aforesaid representation for calling a meeting for consideration of Motion of No Confidence against the President of Zila Parishad, Rohtak by fixing a date and time for meeting, however, despite that fact that the proceedings have remained pending since then, no date/time has been fixed for the said meeting. Section 129 of the Haryana Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 mandates for convening of a meeting within a period of two weeks' of the receipt of the request and that despite the aforesaid statutory period having come to an end, no time and place of the meeting has been conveyed. He further submits that the aforesaid No Confidence Motion has been moved against the President of the Zila Parishad, Rohtak, as 10 out of the 14 elected members of the Zila Parishad have lost confidence in the President and that they have also appeared before the respondent No.2-Deputy Commissioner, Rohtak and presented the said representation. He submits that the affidavits duly sworn by the petitioners have also been appended along with the present petition.

3 Learned counsel for the petitioners, however, contends that at this juncture, the petitioners would be satisfied in case the respondent No.2-Deputy Commissioner, Rohtak, is directed to decide the above said representation by convening a meeting in a time bound manner.

4 Notice of motion.

2024:PHHC:128287



5 Mr. Vivek Saini, Addl. Advocate General, Haryana, who is present through video conference, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents and submits that he has no objection to the aforesaid prayer being allowed and that the respondents No.2 and 3 shall take appropriate steps for convening a meeting for consideration of the representation, if otherwise permissible, as per law. He submits that the appropriate decision/meeting shall be taken/convened within a period of 02 weeks from today.

6 In view of aforesaid statement made by the learned State counsel, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner does not press the instant petition, at this stage.

7 The present writ petition is disposed of accordingly.

8 However, the respondents shall remain bound by the statement made today in the Court.

September 26, 2024.
raj arora

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No