



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

**CWP-4837-2009 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 02.02.2026**

Gurmej Lal and Others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- None for the petitioners.

Mr. Arun Jindal, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. On 16.04.2009, the following order was passed:

“Learned counsel contends that petitioners have been entered in the voter's list of village Puranpur since the year 2000. The petitioners have been issued their ration card from Puranpur and have been issued yellow card and blue card also from Puranpur. Even the pension is being drawn in the same village. Learned counsel contends that for extraneous reasons and on account of political pressures, the petitioners have been served with notice for deletion of their names from the voter's list of Puranpur for the year 2009.

Notice of motion to the respondents for 06.05.2009. In the meantime operation of notice Annexure P-11 shall remain stayed.

Mr. Sandeep Mudgil, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State on the asking of the Court. Six copies of the writ petition would be given to Sh. Mudgil during the course of the day. Respondent nos. 7 to 11 be served by way of dasti process.”

2. The said order was followed by order dated 04.03.2010 which reads as:

*“Learned State counsel submits that during the pendency of this petition, final order has been passed, which is annexed as Annexure R-1 to the reply filed on behalf of respondents No.1, 4 & 6. He, therefore, submits that petitioner has an alternative remedy by way of appeal under Section 24 of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 to challenge the order passed, before the Chief Electoral Officer, Punjab (appellate authority).
Learned counsel for the petitioners, however, submits that the instant writ petition was filed immediately after the issuance of notice to the petitioners and thus, the matter can be decided in writ jurisdiction of this court.
Heard.
Admitted.
No stay.”*

3. Learned State counsel submits that with the efflux of time and preparation of voter list, the instant petition has rendered infructuous.
4. Dismissed as having been rendered infructuous.
5. The petitioners are at liberty to move an appropriate application, if cause survives.
6. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

02.02.2026
Prince Chawla

Whether Speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No