Sl. No.	Date	Office Note, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			2026:UHC:9730 **WPMS/3273/2026** Pooja Kasana --Petitioner **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand & others --Respondents **Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.** Mr. Harshit Sanwal, learned Counsel for petitioner. 2. Mr. Yogesh Pandey, learned Dy.A.G. for the State. 3. Mr. Sahil Mullick, learned Counsel has instructions to appear on behalf of newly elected Committee. 4. Petitioner is aggrieved by order dated 12.10.2026 passed by respondent no.4-Sub-Divisional Magistrate/Prescribed Authority, Haridwar whereby, during pendency of reference proceedings, respondent no.4 has directed the Deputy Registrar, Firms, Societies and Chits, Haridwar, either himself or through a competent representative nominated by him, to provide necessary assistance in handing over charge to the newly elected Committee of Management. 5. Petitioner claims herself to be the member of a residential society, however the fact of the matter is that the said Society has not even been impleaded as party respondent. Petitioner claims that the Prescribed Authority had no authority to pass such orders of handing over charge to the newly elected Society. 6. From a perusal of writ petition, it transpires that the election of Committee of Management of residential society was held on 17.09.2026, and instead of handing over the charge to the newly elected Committee of Management of the Society, petitioner dragged the issue in litigation by filing writ petitions. Earlier also, petitioner had filed WPMS No.3039 of

2026 (Pooja Kasana v. State and others) which was disposed of by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court by order dated 09.10.2026 on the ground that the grievance of petitioner has already been channelized to the alternate efficacious statutory remedy by way of filing Reference before the Prescribed Authority.

7. During pendency of reference proceedings, the Prescribed Authority, by impugned order dated 12.10.2026, has directed the respondent no.2-Dy. Registrar, Firms, Societies and Chits to ensure handing over charge of the Committee of Management of the Society to the newly elected Society.

8. Since the respondent no.2 was directed to handover charge to the newly elected Committee of Management, petitioner has got no locus to challenge the said order.

9. In the facts and circumstances of the case, as mentioned hereinabove, this Court finds that no interference is warranted.

10. The writ petition is, accordingly, dismissed.

11. However, the charge handed over to the newly elected Committee of Management of the Society would remain subject to the final outcome of the Reference.

12. It is further expected from respondent no.4-SDM/ Prescribed Authority, Haridwar to decide the reference proceedings expeditiously, preferably within six months.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
28.10.2026

R.Dang

RAJEEV DANG