GAHC020002852026

**THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT**
**(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)**
**KOHIMA BENCH**

**Case No. : WP(C)/60/2026**

SHRI. G. NEIVOLIE CHADI AND 3 ORS
R/O LOWER KHEL NERHE MODEL VILLAGE, KOHIMA, NAGALAND

2: SHRI VILIE
R/O LOWER KHEL NERHE MODEL VILLAGE
KOHIMA
NAGALAND

3: SHRI KETOULHOUKHO RULHO
R/O LOWER KHEL NERHE MODEL VILLAGE
KOHIMA
NAGALAND

4: SHRI RUOKUOKHOLIE SERE
R/O LOWER KHEL NERHE MODEL VILLAGE
KOHIMA
NAGALAND

VERSUS

THE STATE OF NAGALAND AND 8 ORS
REPRESENTED BY THE CHIEF SECRETARY TO THE GOVT. OF NAGALAND - 797001

2:THE HOME COMMISSIONER
NAGALAND
KOHIMA - 797001

3:THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
KOHIMA
NAGALAND.

4:THE ADDITIONAL DEPUTY COMMISSIONER
CHIEPHOBOZOU

KOHIMA
NAGALAND - 797105

5:THE EXTRA ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER
OFFICE OF THE ADC
CHIEPHOBOZOU
KOHIMA
NAGALAND - 797105

6:SHRI RUDUOKHO USOU
HEAD G.B.
NERHE MODEL VILLAGE
KOHIMA
NAGALAND 797105

7:SHRI PFUZIELE SERE
SESSIONAL CHAIRMAN
NERHE MODEL VILLAGE
LOWER KHEL
KOHIMA
NAGALAND - 797105

8:SHRI RUGUOZETUO KERHUO
LOWER KHEL NERHE MODEL VILLAGE
KOHIMA
NAGALAND - 797105

9:SHRI PEZAVITUO ZIEPHRU
LOWER KHEL NERHE VILLAGE
KOHIMA
NAGALAND - 79701

**Advocate for the Petitioner** : C. T. JAMIR, SR. ADV, O TEMJEN JAMIR,JAWAMONG YADEN,IMTILA PONGEN,NUNGSANG AIER,KROVI TSUKRU,TOSHI JAMIR,ASA RUTSA,ALIBA OZUKUM,I IMCHEN

**Advocate for the Respondent** : ,

**BEFORE**
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N. UNNI KRISHNAN NAIR**

**ORDER**

**Date : 05-10-2026**

Heard Mr. C.T Jamir, learned Senior counsel assisted by Mr. I.

Imchen, learned counsel for the petitioners. Also heard Mr. Moa Imchen, learned Sr. Government Advocate for the State respondents No. 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 and Mr. L. Iralu, learned counsel for the respondents No. 6, 8 & 9.

**2.** The petitioners in the present writ petition have presented a challenge to a communication dated 22.04.2026, issued by the Office of the Additional Deputy Commissioner, Chiephobozou, Nagaland, directing the Head GB, Nerhe Model Village, to select the Village Council Members for the Lower Khel as per customary practice and usage of the village and submit the list on or before 24.04.2026, on the ground that the selection of the Village Council Members for the Lower Khel was already concluded on 25.03.2026 with the election of the petitioners as the Village Council Members.

**3.** The facts in brief requisite for adjudication of the issue arising in the present writ petition is noted as under:

> Nerhe Model Village is a recognized village under the Government of Nagaland and accordingly, the village is established and governed by the provisions of the Nagaland Village and Tribal Councils Act, 1978 (as amended).
>
> In terms of the provisions of Section 4 of the said Act, a process was initiated vide issuance of a Notification dated 13.03.2026, for election of Village Council Members of all recognized villages under Kohima District, including Nerhe Model Village.

**4.** It is projected by the petitioners that the election/selection, insofar as the Nerhe Model Village is concerned was to be so made against 4(four) posts of Village Council Members. 6(six) nominations

came to be received in the matter, i.e., from the petitioners and the respondents No. 8 and 9. It is projected that a meeting for the selection of the Village Council Members under Nerhe Model Village, Lower Khel, was held on 25.03.2026. In terms of the resolutions adopted in the said meeting, the persons eligible to vote, in the selection process, was set out and it was also provided that a single voter can cast vote 4(four) times to elect 4(four) Village Council Members.

**5.** The petitioners project that as the election process was underway, the respondents No. 8 & 9 staged a walkout from the said meeting. However, the voting process continued and the petitioners, herein, came to be selected for appointment as Village Council Members for the said village.

**6.** It is projected that after the petitioners were elected as Village Council Members, the respondent No. 6 who was the Head GB (Gaonbura) of the village, along with respondents No. 8 & 9 had approached the respondent authorities disputing the selection/election held on 25.03.2026, for selection of 4(four) Village Council Members for the village in question.

**7.** On receipt of the said complaint preferred in the matter by the respondent No. 6 as well as by respondents No. 8 and 9, the Office of the Additional Deputy Commissioner, Chiephobozou, Nagaland, vide communication dated 22.04.2026, noticing the dispute arising in the selection process held on 25.03.2026, required the Head Gaonbura to select the Village Council Members for Lower Khel as per customary practice and usage of the village and submit the list on or before 24.04.2026. The communication dated

22.04.2026, having the effect of holding a fresh selection process, the petitioners approached the Office of the Additional Deputy Commissioner, Chiephobozou, raising a grievance in this connection and praying that the earlier selection/election process held on 25.03.2026, be approved. No action having been taken on the basis of the request made by the petitioners, and dates for holding of a fresh election process being notified by the Head Gaonbura, the petitioners have instituted the present writ petition.

**8.** Mr. C. T. Jamir, learned Sr. counsel for the petitioners by referring to the provisions of Section 4 of the Nagaland Village and Area Councils Act, 1978, (hereinafter referred to as the Act of 1978), has submitted that the Village Council Members are to be chosen by the villagers in accordance with the prevailing customary practices and usages. He submits that the customary practice having not been codified, the villagers in the meeting held on 25.03.2026, convened for the purpose of electing members as Village Council Members, had adopted resolutions with regard to the manner in which such election would be regulated. He submits that after laying down the eligibility of a villager to cast his vote, it was further decided that a single voter would cast 4(four) votes to elect 4(four) Village Council Members.

**9.** Mr. Jamir, submits that the said decision being a unanimous decision adopted in the meeting held on 25.03.2026, the same has to be reckoned to be the basis on which the election would be permissible to be held.

**10.** Mr. Jamir submits that in terms of the said decision, the petitioners, herein, were elected by the eligible villagers, as Village

Council Members.

**11.** Mr. Jamir further submits that the respondent No. 6, who is the village Head Gaonbura had approached the jurisdictional Deputy Commissioner, by submitting a complaint questioning the methodology adopted for casting of votes in the meeting held on 25.03.2026 and by projecting that such election of Village Council Members was required to be conducted by adopting the one voter, one vote principle. It was further projected that the principle of one voter - one vote was in accordance with the customary practice and usage of the village in question.

**12.** Mr. Jamir submits that the respondents No. 8 & 9 had also submitted similar applications before the jurisdictional Additional Deputy Commissioner disputing the selection/election so held for selection of Village Council Members on 25.03.2026.

**13.** Mr. C.T Jamir, learned Senior counsel by referring to the communication dated 22.04.2026, has submitted that the Office of jurisdictional Additional Deputy Commissioner had exceeded its jurisdiction in entertaining the complaint preferred by the Head Gaonbura, i.e., the respondent No. 6, and requiring him to take steps for selection of Village Council Members for the Lower Khel as per customary practice and usage of the village.

**14.** Mr. Jamir, learned Senior counsel by referring to the provisions of Section 20 of the Act of 1978, submits that the District authorities have no jurisdiction in the matter when a election/selection of a member of a Village Council is disputed and under such circumstances, the matter is mandatorily required to be referred to the State Government, whose decision, thereon, shall be final.

**15.** Mr. Jamir submits that the communication dated 22.04.2026 is in the teeth of the provisions of Section 20 of the Act of 1978 and accordingly, the same would mandate an interference from this Court.

**16.** Mr. Jamir, learned Senior counsel, further submits that a perusal of the Minutes of the Meeting held on 25.03.2026, for selection of Village Council members for the village in question, would go to reveal that the election, therein, of the petitioners against the 4(four) posts of Village Council Members was an unanimous decision of the House, and the same would not be permissible to be discarded only on the ground that the respondents No. 8 & 9 as well as the respondent No. 6, had subsequently raised a dispute in the matter.

**17.** Mr. Jamir submits that the decision as contained in the Minutes of the Meeting dated 25.03.2026, with regard to the manner in which the election is to be conducted, being the decision of the majority of the villagers attending the said meeting, the procedure as set out is to be reckoned as the procedure, which is required to be followed for the election of the Village Council Members of the said village.

**18.** Mr. Jamir further submits that from the affidavit filed by the respondents, it is seen that by relying on a communication dated 30.04.2026, it has been projected that the dispute with regard to the selection of Village Council Members of the Lower Khel has been referred to the Government. He, however, submits that the said communication dated 30.04.2026, was not made to the Government, but to the Deputy Commissioner, Kohima. Accordingly,

Mr. Jamir submits that the dispute as projected by the respondents No. 6, 8 and 9, is yet to be forwarded to the Government for its consideration.

**19.** In the above premises, Mr. Jamir submits that the communication dated 22.04.2026 along with the consequential steps taken, thereon, would mandate an interference from this Court, with a further direction to the respondent authorities to grant approval to the selection of the petitioners as Village Council Members in the meeting of the villagers convened for the purpose, on 25.03.2026.

**20.** Per contra, Mr. Moa Imchen, learned Senior Government Advocate appearing for the State respondents, i.e., the respondents No. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, has submitted that the selection of persons as Village Council Members is to be so made by the villagers of the village concerned, in accordance with the prevailing customary practices and usages. He submits that an incomplete list of nominated Village Council Members was received by the Office of the jurisdictional Additional Deputy Commissioner. However, the same was without the counter signature of the Head Gaonbura nor was forwarded by the Head Gaonbura of the Village Council.

**21.** Mr. Imchen has further submitted that in view of the method adopted for selection of Village Council Members in the meeting of the villagers held on 25.03.2026, certain individuals had reportedly walked out during the selection process and raised their objections regarding the same before the jurisdictional Additional Deputy Commissioner.

**22.** Mr. Imchen submits that the dispute with regard to the selection of Village Council Members, so conducted in the Meeting

held on 25.03.2026, is with regard to the criteria applied, therein, of *"one person four votes",* which was projected by the complainants to be not in accordance with the prevailing customary practice of the village.

**23.** Mr. Imchen further submits that the dispute coming to the notice of the jurisdictional Additional Deputy Commissioner, and he also being apprised that as per the customary practice of the village, such election was to be conducted by adopting the principle of *"one voter - one vote"*, the Additional Deputy Commissioner had vide the communication dated 22.04.2026 required the Head Gaonbura to conduct the election afresh by following the customary practice followed in this connection in the village in question. He submits that in view of the above position, the directions contained in the communication dated 22.04.2026 cannot be held to be erroneous.

**24.** Mr. Imchen, having made such submission, has submitted that subsequently, the dispute as arising with regard to the selection of Village Council Members for the Nerhe Model Village, specifically for Lower Khel, thereof, was referred to the Government invoking the proviso to Section 6(a) of the Act of 1978 (as amended).

**25.** Mr. Imchen accordingly submits that the matter would now be required to be considered by the Government. However, such consideration was not permissible to be made in view of the pendency of the present proceedings and the interim direction passed by this Court on 30.04.2026.

**26.** Mr. L. Iralu, learned counsel appearing for the respondents, by reiterating the submissions made by Mr. Moa Imchen, learned Senior Government Advocate, has submitted that the methodology adopted

for selection of persons as Village Council Members in the meeting held on 25.03.2026 was alien to the customary practice followed in the said village. He submits that as per the customary practice, for the purpose of selection of Village Council Members, each household of the village is entitled to have one vote. However, the principle now applied for such selection in the meeting held on 25.03.2026, has resulted in one household to have 4(four) votes. He submits that during the said meeting held on 25.03.2026, serious disagreements had arisen in the matter between two groups, particularly with regard to the manner of casting of votes for selection of Village Council Members.

**27.** Mr. L. Iralu further submits that the respondent No. 6, who is the Sessional Secretary of the meeting had not appended his signature to the minutes of the meeting and accordingly, he did not approve the selection/election of the petitioners in the said meeting. However, he submits that on account of pressure being created, the Sessional Secretary had appended his signature on the minutes after 06.04.2026 and the said aspect of the matter was stated on oath by way of swearing an affidavit by the Sessional Secretary on 11.06.2026.

**28.** Mr. Iralu submits that on the date of the selection, i.e., on 25.03.2026, noticing the anomaly so existing in the selection process adopted, the respondents No. 8 & 9 along with respondent No. 6 had submitted a complaint in this connection before the jurisdictional Additional Deputy Commissioner.

**29.** Mr. L. Iralu further submits that a dispute having arisen in the matter, the matter would now be required to be referred to the

Government in accordance with the proviso to Section 6(a) read with Section 20 of the Act of 1978.

**30.** Mr. Iralu has submitted that in terms of the past practice followed for such election in the village in question, the elections were conducted by applying the principle of "*one person, one vote*". He submits that in the present election process also, insofar as the Upper Khel is concerned, the election for selection of Village Council Members were so conducted by applying the principle of "*one person, one vote*".

**31.** In view of the election being disputed, Mr. Iralu submits that the contention of the learned Senior Counsel of the petitioner that the process for selection of Village Council Members for the village in question was concluded, would not mandate an acceptance from this Court.

**32.** In the above premises, Mr. Iralu submits that a dispute having been raised in the matter and the same also being forwarded to the Government, this Court at this stage would be pleased not to direct for appointment of the petitioners as the Village Council Members in terms of their purported selection for the purpose in the meeting held on 25.03.2026.

**33.** I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and also perused the materials available on record.

**34.** The process for selection of Village Council Members to the Village Councils set up for recognized villages under Kohima District was initiated vide issuance of a Notification dated 13.03.2026. Clause-3 of the said notification mandates that the Area Administrative Officers (AAO's) are required to specify the mode of

representation (clan or khel) and the method of selection or election according to established customary practices for all villages within their jurisdiction.

**35.** From the materials brought on record, this Court does not find that there was any specification made by the jurisdictional Area Administrative Officer, with regard to the method to be adopted for selection or election of Village Council Members insofar as Model Village, Lower Khel is concerned. This Court finds that after the issuance of the said Notification dated 13.03.2026, a meeting of the villagers of Nerhe Model Village, Lower Khel was convened on 25.03.2026 at the Nerhe Model Village Council Hall.

**36.** On 25.03.2026, 80(eighty) persons were in attendance. However, as per the household tax collection list, only 69 of them were found to be genuine voters. The House thereafter, unanimously agreed to allow 59 voters to cast their votes, as 10 tax paying household persons were found to be absent. The 59 voters, thereafter, were required to cast their votes. However, only 46 voters turned up to cast their votes.

**37.** At this stage, the respondents No. 8 & 9 staged a walkout of the election proceeding. However, from the minutes of the meeting of the said meeting, it is found that the selection process was carried out and basing on the majority of votes received, the petitioners herein, who were nominees for the post of Village Council Members along with the respondents No. 8 & 9, were elected as Village Council Members of Nerhe Model Village, Lower Khel for the period 2026-2031. The minutes of the meeting also contains rules and regulations for Lower Khel Nerhe Model Village

for selection of Village Council Members. In terms of the same, an eligible voter would be one who has a house and had paid household tax up to 2026. It was further laid down that a single person can cast vote 4(four) times to elect four Village Council Members.

**38.** It is this principle adopted for the purpose of selection, i.e., the decision to permit a single voter to cast vote 4(four) times, that had led to a dispute between two groups of villagers of the said village, the petitioners belonging to one of the groups while the respondents No. 8 & 9 belongs to the other group.

**39.** From the materials brought on record, this Court finds that on the same day, that is on 25.03.2026, the respondents No. 8 & 9 along with the respondent No. 6, had lodged a complaint with regard to the methodology adopted in the Meeting held on 25.03.2026 for selection of Village Council Members of the said village. A dispute admittedly having arisen with regard to the selection/election of Village Council Members for the said village, this Court would now examine as regards the provisions existing in the Act of 1978, laying down the manner for redressal of such disputes. Provisions of Section 6(a) of the Act of 1978 (as amended) being relevant, is extracted hereinbelow:

> *(a) The process of formation of the Village Councils will get initiated with the issuance of a general notification by the Government, and the entire process should be completed within the period given in the said notification, which shall not be more than 3 (three) months. Every Village Council so formed will continue for a tenure of 5 (five) years, provided in case of any new Village Council being constituted during the*

*interregnum period, the said Council shall continue for the remaining tenure as originally notified by the Government;*

*Provided further that any dispute regarding the constitution of the Village Council or selection of any one as member of the Village Council, the matter shall be referred to the State Government whose decision thereon shall be final."*

**40.** Further, the provisions of Section 20 of the Act of 1978 being relevant for the adjudication of the issue arising in the present writ petition, the same is also extracted, herein, below:

"*20. When a dispute arises as to the selection of any member of a Village Council, the matter shall be referred to the State Government whose decision thereon shall be final.*"

**41.** A perusal of the provisions of Clause 6(a) would go to reveal that the process of formation of a Village Council is initiated with the issuance of general notification by the government, and the entire process is to be completed within the period as given in the notification, which shall not be more than 3(three) months. Every Village Council so constituted would continue for a term of 5(five) years. Proviso to Section 6(a) mandates that any dispute regarding the constitution of the Village Council or selection of any one as member of the village council, the matter shall be referred to the State Government whose decision, thereon, shall be final.

**42.** Provisions of Section 20 of the Act of 1978 also stipulate that when a dispute arises as to the selection of any member of a Village Council, the matter shall be referred to the State Government whose decision, thereon, shall be final.

**43.** Having noticed the provisions existing in the Act of 1978 for the purpose of resolution of a dispute arising during the course of selection/election of Village Council Members of a particular village, this Court would now examine the steps taken in the matter by the respondent authorities after a complaint in the matter was lodged by the respondents No. 6, 8 and 9. After the complaint was lodged by the respondent No. 6 as well as by the respondents No. 8 and 9, the Office of the jurisdictional Additional Deputy Commissioner, appreciating the projections made by the respondent No. 6, in his complaint and noticing that as per the customary practice and usage, selection of Village Council Members in the village was to be made on *"one man, one vote"* principle, proceeded to direct the respondent No. 6 to select the Village Council Members for Lower Khel as per customary practice and usage of the village and to submit the list of such members on or before 24.04.2026.

**44.** A perusal of the said communication would go to reveal that basing on the complaint lodged by the respondent No.6, the election/selection of Village Council Members, that is the petitioners, herein, made in the meeting of the villagers held on 25.03.2026 was discarded and a fresh selection/election process was directed to be carried out. The petitioners are aggrieved by the said direction passed by the Office of the jurisdictional Additional Deputy Commissioner in the present proceedings.

**45.** As noticed herein above, admittedly a dispute exists with regard to the procedure adopted in the meeting held on 25.03.2026 for the selection/election of Village Council Members for the village in question. While one group, supporting the petitioners, has projected that as per the customary practice, the election is to be so

held by permitting one voter to cast vote 4(four) times, the other group, which supports the respondents No. 8 and 9, have on the contrary, projected that as per the customary practice and usage, such selection is to be held by applying the principle of *"one household, one vote".*

**46.** The respondent No. 6, who is the Head Gaonbura of the village, in his complaint has highlighted that the election in question has to be so held in terms of the earlier practice by adopting the *"one man, one vote"* system.

**47.** The dispute having arisen in the matter, the same is permissible to be so redressed only by following the procedure laid down in the Act of 1978. As noticed herein above, the procedure for redressal of such disputes is in terms of the prescription made in the proviso to Section 6(a) read with Section 20 of the Act. However, the Government as of yet has not examined the matter.

**48.** Having noticed the procedure set out in the provision of the Act of 1978, for the purpose of resolving a dispute arising with regard to selection/election of a person as a Village Council Member, this Court would now consider the challenge presented by the petitioners to the communication dated 22.04.2026. The said communication dated 22.04.2026 being relevant, the same is extracted herein below:

"*GOVERNMENT OF NAGALAND*
*OFFICE OF THE ADDITIONAL DEPUTY COMMISSIONER*
*CHIEPHOBOZOU: NAGALAND*

*No.ADC/CPBZ/VC/VDB/GB/NM/ 708// Dated Chiephobozou the 22nd April 2026*

*To,*

*The Head GB*

*Nerhe Model Village*

*Sub:* ***Regarding selection of VCM in Lower Khel***

*The office of the undersigned is in receipt of your application stating that the customary practice and usage for selection of VCM in your village has been based on one man one vote. The Nagaland Village Council and Tribal Councils Act, 1978 mandates that "A village Council shall consists of members chosen by Villagers in accordance with the prevailing customary practices and usages". In this regard, I am directed to state that you are requested to select the Village Council members for lower Khel as per the customary practice and usage of your village and submit the list to the office of the undersigned on or before 24th April 2026.*

*This is for your kind information and further necessary action, please.*

*Yours faithfully,*

*(VIKETOULIE METHA)NCS*
*Extra Assistant Commissioner*
*Office of the Addl. Deputy Commissioner*
*Chiephobozou: Nagaland."*

**49.** A perusal of the said communication dated 22.04.2026, would go to reveal that the same was issued in response to a communication dated 22.04.2026, issued by the respondent No.6, highlighting the irregularity committed in conduct of election of 4(four) Village Council Members for Nerhe Village Lower Khel, on account of adoption of the principle of "*one voter, four votes",* in the place of the "*one voter, one vote",* which was projected to be the existing practice. Noticing the irregularity as highlighted by the respondent No. 6, vide the said communication dated 22.04.2026,

instructions came to be used for selection of Village Council Members for Lower Khel as per the customary practice and usage of the village.

**50.** The contents of the communication dated 22.04.2026, issued by the respondent No. 6 and the earlier complaints lodged by the respondent No. 8 & 9, clearly brings to the forefront a dispute arising with regard the selection of Village Council Members for the village council of the village, in question. Accordingly, in view of the provisions of the proviso to section 6(a) read with section 20 of the Act, 1978, the district administration was required to forthwith forward the dispute to the government for consideration and resolution. In view of the provision of section 6(a) read with section 20 of the Act of 19789, no authority other than the government, had the jurisdiction to consider such dispute.

**51.** Accordingly, in the light of the provisions of the Act of 1978, this Court is of the considered view that the Office of the Additional Deputy Commissioner, Chiephobozou had exceeded its jurisdiction in entertaining a dispute raised before it, with regard to selection/election of Village Council Members. This Court holds that the Additional Deputy Commissioner and, for the said purpose, the Office of the Deputy Commissioner, has no jurisdiction to entertain and decide any dispute arising in connection with selection/election of Village Council Members, under the provisions of the Act of 1978, (as amended).

**52.** In view of the above discussions, the impugned communication dated 22.04.2026, having been found to have been issued without jurisdiction, the same stands set aside.

**53.** Having interfered with the communication dated 22.04.2026, this Court, in view of the provisions of the proviso to Section 6(a) read with Section 20 of the Act of 1978, directs the Deputy Commissioner, Kohima District to refer the dispute with regard to the selection of Village Council Members to the Village Council required to be constituted under the provisions of the Act of 1978, for Nerhe Village, Lower Khel, to the Government, for a decision.

**54.** As noticed herein above, the dispute being in relation to the procedure required to be adopted for selection/election of Village Council members for the village in question, and there being two points of view advanced in the matter, the Government, shall, before arriving at its decision in the matter, provide a hearing to the petitioners as well as the respondents No. 8 & 9, who were nominees for the post of Village Council Members of the village in question, for the purpose of ascertaining the customary practice in vogue in this connection.

**55.** Upon hearing the petitioners as well as the respondents No. 8 & 9 and/or any other authority as may be deemed necessary, the Government, shall proceed to pass appropriate orders in the matter.

**56.** In the event the Government is of the view that a fresh election is mandated in the matter, and the earlier process of election is to be discarded, the Government shall also ascertain the customary practice of the village in question and/or the past practice followed for the purpose of election/selection of Village Council Members for constituting the village council for the village in question, and set the same out in the order that would now be required to be passed by the Government in the matter.

**57.** In the affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents No. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, it is projected that the dispute has already been referred to the Government. In the event such dispute has already been referred, the Government would now proceed in the matter in the light of the directions passed, hereinabove, and on conclusion of the process, pass appropriate orders in the matter. The entire exercise be initiated and concluded within a period of 2(two) months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

**58.** Till fresh orders are passed in the matter in terms of the directions passed herein above, status quo with regard to the constitution of the Village Council for Nerhe Village (Model Village), Lower Khel, shall be maintained by the parties.

**59.** With the above observations and directions, the present writ petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-

**JUDGE**

**Comparing Assistant**