

2026 PII IC:045960



165

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

**CWP-8828-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 23.03.2026**

Karamjeet Kaur

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Mr. Robin Singh Bhullar, Advocate and
Mr. Jashandeep Singh Sidhu, 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 the official respondents No.2 to 4 to take appropriate action against respondents No.6 to 9, under Section 20 of the Punjab Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (in short 'the 1994 Act'), as they have refused to act for the welfare and development works of the village.

1.1 A further prayer has been made for directing the official respondents not to take any steps to appoint an Administrator of Gram Panchayat, Village Kotli Dewan, Block and District Sri Muktsar Sahib, in place of the petitioner Karamjeet Kaur (Sarpanch), in pursuance of letter

dated 11.03.2026 (Annexure P-13) issued by the learned District Development and Panchayat Officer, Sri Muktsar Sahib.

2. At this stage, Mr. Harpreet Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, appears on behalf of the respondent-State, in pursuance of the advance copy of paper book having already been supplied to him. He, on instructions from Mr. Surinder Singh Dhillon, District Development and Panchayat Officer, Sri Muktsar Sahib, submits that the District Development and Panchayat Officer, Sri Muktsar Sahib, has requisitioned a meeting of all the Members (including the petitioner) of the Gram Panchayat on 27.03.2026 in his office, for discussing the development works of the village. It is further submitted that in case the petitioner participates in the said meeting, necessary proceedings shall be carried out in accordance with law. He further submits that in the event of equality of votes, the petitioner – Karamjeet Kaur (Sarpanch) shall be permitted to exercise her right of casting vote in terms of Section 24(3) of the 1994 Act.

2.1 Learned State counsel further submits that any decision with regard to the appointment of an Administrator shall be considered by the competent authority only after the aforesaid meeting is held.

2.2 As regards the prayer of the petitioner seeking action against private respondents No.6 to 9 for alleged non-cooperation in development works, learned State counsel submits that the petitioner may raise such grievances before the concerned District Development and Panchayat Officer in the aforesaid meeting, and an appropriate decision shall be taken thereupon, after affording due opportunity of hearing to all concerned parties and in accordance with law.

3. Keeping in view the aforesaid submissions made by learned

State counsel, no further orders are required to be passed in the present writ petition and the same is, accordingly, disposed of.

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

23.03.2026
Apurva

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

- 1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
- 2. Whether reportable : Yes/No