



CWP-28377-2025

-1-

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

(145)

CWP-28377-2025

Date of decision:- 22.09.2025

Dalbir Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Anshul Baghla, Advocate for the petitioner.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Instant petition has been filed *inter-alia* for issuance of a writ, in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondent-authorities to take a decision on complaint dated 12.12.2024, Annexure P-12.
2. Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner contested the election of Sarpanch of village Bhangwan, Jandiala Guru, Amritsar on 15.10.2024 against Paramjeet Kaur. He asserts that respondent No.6, who is a close relative of his opponent and was posted at Government High School, Rana Kala, Amritsar, was on election duty and campaigned in favour of his opponent. Counsel submits that the petitioner has filed a complaint, Annexure P-2, with respondent-authorities against respondent No.6 for campaigning and influencing the voters when Model Code of Conduct was in force. He submits that the complaint has been dealt with in a biased manner.
3. Counsel for the petitioner has been heard and the documents appended with the petition have been perused.



CWP-28377-2025

-2-

4. Complaint, Annexure P-2, submitted by the petitioner has been inquired into by the Principal, Government Senior Secondary School, Investigating Officer. Petitioner was associated with the investigation and was called upon to produce evidence. Besides recording his statement, petitioner produced screen shots of CCTV. Investigating Officer found that pictures taken from CCTV depicted the date as 19.09.2024 and a woman was visible, who could not be identified. As per the findings recorded by him, the Model Code of Conduct came into force on 25.09.2024 and the screenshots of 19.09.2024 do not substantiate the allegation levelled by the petitioner. Statement of respondent No.6 was separately recorded, who denied all the allegations and has stated that she was discharging her duty as per the instructions issued to her. Statement of respondent No.6 was verified from the record and was found to be correct. Inquiry Officer came to the conclusion that the complaint has been filed due to some personal enmity. The evidence produced by the petitioner was found to be insufficient to proceed with the complaint, which was recommended to be filed vide report dated 10.02.2025, Annexure P-3. During the course of hearing before this Court, petitioner could not produce any additional material to substantiate the allegation. No error could be pointed out in the report of the Inquiry Officer.

5. Finding no merit in the petition, it is dismissed, though with no order as to costs.

22.09.2025

Kamal

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No