



\$~2

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 8192/2026 & CM APPL. 38918/2026**

DEVENDER YADAV & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sakal Bhushan, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Sunil Kumar, Mr. Prateek
Mohan Sinha, Mr. Vasu Bhushan, Mr.
Nipun Bhushan and Mr. Krishnendu
Das, Advocates.

versus

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Dama Seshadri Naidu, Senior
Advocate (*through* VC) with Mr.
Prateek Kumar, Mr. Ashish Shukla,
Mr. Deepak Sharma and Mr. Kumar
Utsav, Advocates for R-1 & 2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

01.07.2026

%

1. The present writ petition has been filed seeking the following reliefs:

(a) Writ of Mandamus or Certiorari or any other appropriate Writ or Direction or Order thereby, to partially Set Aside and quash Clause 9 Sub-Clause d (iii) & (iv) of the Guidelines dated 24.06.2025 for Special Intensive Revision (SIR) issued by Respondent no.1 to the extent wherein the personal undertaking of booth level agents (BLA) is required for verification of the particulars contained in enumeration forms being violative of additional/modified guidelines dated 14.05.2026 issued by the respondent no.1 AND consequently partially set-aside and quash Para (i) of the Letter / Circular dated 27.04.2026 issued by Respondent no.2



(b) Issue an appropriate writ, order, or direction directing the Respondents to provide to Petitioners printed and soft copies of the Electoral Rolls of 2002 and the Frozen Photo Electoral roll, as and when the same is frozen by the respondents before enforcing SIR in NCT of Delhi, so as to ensure effective assistance and participation of Booth Level Agents (BLAS), appointed by Delhi Pradesh Congress Committee, in the Special Intensive Revision (SIR).

2. Mr. Dama Seshadri Naidu, senior counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-Election Commission of India (hereinafter 'ECI') vehemently opposes the maintainability of the present writ petition and the relief sought thereinbefore this Court.

2.1 He has handed over a compilation which contains various orders passed by the Supreme Court and other High Courts. He has specifically drawn attention to the identical orders passed by the Supreme Court on 11th November, 2025 in the W.P. (C) 1074 of 2025, titled '***Dola Sen v. Election Commission of India***' and W.P. (C) 1088 of 2025, titled '***Shubhankar Sarkar v. Election Commission of India***'. Paragraph 5 of the said order is set out below:

"5. Since this Court is seized of the matter pertaining to validity of Special Intensive Revision (SIR) of Electoral Rolls in various States, including Bihar, West Bengal, Tamil Nadu, Pondicherry etc., we request the jurisdictional High Courts to keep in abeyance/defer the writ proceedings, if any, filed in those High Courts touching the validity of the SIR of electoral rolls in their respective States."

3. Mr. Sakal Bhushan, senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that since the challenge raised in the present writ petition is not with regard to legality of the SIR process, the present writ petition is



maintainable before this Court. He submits that the issue which is pending before the Supreme Court in relation to SIR already stands decided *vide* judgement dated 27th May, 2026.

4. In response, Mr. Naidu submits that matters pertaining to SIR are pending before the Supreme Court. He has drawn attention of the Court to an order passed by the High Court of Sikkim on 12th June, 2026 in W.P.(PIL) No.7 of 2026, titled '***Devender Yadav v. Election Commission of India***' wherein the Court takes note of the fact that the issues raised in the petition therein do not directly concern the legality of the Special Intensive Revision of Electoral Rolls (hereinafter 'SIR'), but relate to the procedure involved for SIR in the state of Sikkim. Nevertheless, the Court has refused to entertain the said writ petition. The relevant observations from the said order are set out below:

“Be that as it may, at the outset, we note that the issues raised herein do not directly concern the legality of the Special Intensive Revision (SIR) but rather relate to the procedure evolved for the implementation of the SIR process by the Election Commission of India in the state of Sikkim. Nevertheless, having regard attention of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, we are of the view that it would not be to the fact that issues arising out of the SIR process are presently engaging the appropriate for this Court to independently examine the matter unless the Hon'ble Supreme Court permits such consideration.”

5. In view of the aforesaid orders, this Court is of the view that it may not be appropriate to entertain the present writ petition in the absence of a clarification from the Supreme Court. The petitioner would be at liberty to obtain the necessary clarification from the Supreme Court.



6. Accordingly, the petition, along with pending application, stands disposed of.

JULY 1, 2026

Rzu

AMIT BANSAL, J