



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

**RA-CW-185-2026 in
CWP-1307-2026
Date of Decision: 10.04.2026**

USHA RANI AND OTHERS

....Appellant(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUKHVINDER KAUR**

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh Chauhan, AG, Haryana with
Mr. Deepak Balyan, Addl. AG, Haryana and
Mr. Rahul Mohan, Addl. AG, Haryana
for applicant/respondent Nos.1, 2 & 4 to 6.

Mr. Gaurav Rana, Advocate
for the non-applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Jagdish Manchanda, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Nischal Chetanya Manchanda, Advocate
for non-applicant/respondent No.3 – MC Panchkula.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J. (Oral)

1. The present application has been filed for review of the judgment dated 08.04.2026 passed by this Bench.
2. The limited question for which State of Haryana has sought review is according to them, the total population of the current geographical limits of Municipal Corporation, Panchkula, in fact based on the 2011 census is taken into account while issuing the notification dated 04.09.2026.
3. We have also heard learned counsel for the applicant- respondent Nos.1, 2 & 4 to 6 and counsel for the non-applicant, and the following clarification would suffice the controversy. It shall be appropriate to reproduce paragraph No.30 of the judgment which reads as follows:-

"30. The seats could have been re-distributed only on the basis of Census of 2011 by counting the population as per 2011 Census, as per the current geographical limits and such process might have led to decrease, increase, or no change in the seats to be reserved for the categories belonging to the

Scheduled Castes communities, depending upon the population of the current geographical area of Panchkula at the time when the last Census was conducted, i.e., as per the Census of 2011. ”

4. It is always permissible to State of Haryana to issue a fresh notification based upon the population of current geographical limits of Panchkula, by taking into account the population of 2011 census as is mentioned in paragraph No.30 (supra).
5. It is clarified that this order is only for the purpose of notifying seats for SC category in Municipal Corporation, Panchkula.
6. Learned State Counsel submits that even in other Municipalities they have followed 2011 census but as on date we are not concerned with the other but concerned with Municipal Corporation, Panchkula, and the judgment was only for Panchkula.
7. With the aforesaid observation, present review petition stands disposed of.
- Copy of this order be given to State counsel under the signatures of Bench Secretary.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)

JUDGE

(SUKHVINDER KAUR)

JUDGE

April 10, 2026

Sangeeta

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