

2025:PHHC:102790



126

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

CWP-22937-2025

Date of Decision: 08.08.2025

Harpreet Singh and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Mr. J.S. Bhandohal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harpreet Singh, AAG, Punjab.

HARSH BUNGER J. (ORAL)

Petition herein is, *inter alia*, seeking a writ in the nature of Mandamus, directing official respondents No.1 to 4 to allow petitioner No.1 to exercise the right of casting vote in terms of Section 24(3) of the Punjab Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (in short 'the 1994 Act').

1.1 A further prayer has been made for setting aside order dated 17.07.2025 (Annexure P-5) passed by the learned District Development and Panchayat Officer, Patiala.

1.2 Another prayer has been made for directing official respondents No.1 to 4 to take action against respondents No.5 to 9 under Section 20(b) of the 1994 Act.

2. In the present case, the petitioners are aggrieved against the order dated 17.07.2025 (Annexure P-5), whereby the District Development

and Panchayat Officer, Patiala, had appointed an Administrator for the Gram Panchayat, Mandour, District Patiala, under Section 200 of the 1994 Act, for a period of thirty days to manage the affairs of the Gram Panchayat.

3. It is noticeable that the aforesaid order was passed on 17.07.2025, and the present writ petition came up for hearing before this Court on 08.08.2025. Concededly, vide the impugned order dated 17.07.2025 (Annexure P-5), the Administrator was appointed for a limited period of thirty days. Even otherwise, the said order is amenable to revision under Section 201 of the 1994 Act. In this regard, reference can be made to the judgment rendered by this Court in **“Binder Kaur v. State of Punjab and others” reported as 2016(1) RCR(Civil) 634**, the relevant extract of which reads as under:-

“5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the material available on record, Section 201 of the Act gives power to the Director, Rural Development and Panchayat, Punjab to entertain revision petition against the order of the DD&PO passed under Section 200(1) of the Act.

6. Thus, the present petition is not maintainable and hence the same is hereby dismissed. However, the petitioner is granted liberty to challenge the impugned order before the Director, Rural Development and Panchayat, Punjab by way of a revision petition under Section 201 of the Act. It is further directed that in case such a revision is filed within seven days from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order, the Director, Rural Development and Panchayat, Punjab shall decide the same within one month thereafter. The petitioner may take other pleas also in the said petition, which shall be decided by the Director, Rural Development and Panchayat, Punjab.”

3.1 A similar view, as taken in **Binder Kaur’s** case (*supra*), has also been taken in the cases of **“Surjit Kaur vs. State of Punjab”, 2017(1)**

RCR(Civil) 300; “Dona Singh vs. The State of Punjab and others”, 2020(4) Law Herald 2821; and “Gurbhej Singh @ Gurjant Singh vs. State of Punjab and others”, 2022(3) PLR 348.

4. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the present writ petition is dismissed, while leaving it open to the petitioners to avail appropriate remedies under Section 201 of the 1994 Act. As regards the other reliefs sought in this writ petition, the petitioners would be at liberty to raise such contentions before the Revisional Authority in accordance with law.

5. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand closed.

08.08.2025

Apurva

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

2. Whether reportable : Yes/No