



IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.1791 of 2026

Reserved on: 02.03.2026

Date of decision: 10.03.2026

Nehru Yuva Club of Village Manlog-Badog & Anr. ...Petitioners.

Versus

State of H.P. & Ors. ...Respondents.

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Vivek Singh Thakur, Judge.

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ranjan Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?¹ Yes.

For the petitioners : Mr. Prem Chand Verma, Mr. Varun Thakur
and Mr. Aakash Thakur, Advocates.

For the respondent(s) : Mr. Anup Rattan, Advocate General with
Mr. Raj Negi, Deputy Advocate General.

Vivek Singh Thakur, Judge

Petitioners, namely Nehru Yuva Club of Village Manlog-Badog and Mahila Mandal of Village Manlog-Badog, have preferred present petition against inclusion of Village Manlog Badog in Gram Panchayat Darlaghat, District Solan, after exclusion of the said village from Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog vide notification dated 27.01.2026 (Annexure P-3).

2. It is the case of the petitioners that, by issuing notification dated 18.12.2025, proposing reorganization/merger of

¹ *Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the Judgment? Yes*



Panchayats, objections and suggestions from the residents of the concerned Gram Panchayats were invited, authorizing Deputy Commissioner, Solan to receive objections and suggestions from the public and to submit final recommendations after considering the same. The proposal for inclusion of Village Manlog Badog in Gram Panchayat Darlaghat after exclusion of the same from Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog was opposed by the residents of Manlog Badog by submitting objections dated 30.12.2025 on 31.12.2025 to the Additional District Magistrate, Solan, with copies thereof to the District Panchayat Adhikari and Deputy Commissioner, Solan, stating that few years ago, such proposal had been accepted by some villagers, but the present scenario is completely different and most of the villagers are not interested in inclusion of Manlog Badog in Gram Panchayat Darlaghat, as relations and day-to-day business of residents of Village Manlog Badog are interwoven with residents of Village Hanuman Badog, as both villages are contiguous. Attention of the authorities was also invited to the application submitted by residents of Gram Panchayat Darlaghat opposing the inclusion of Manlog Badog in Gram Panchayat Darlaghat.

3. Nothing was heard with respect to the aforesaid objections. Instead, the respondents issued impugned notification



dated 27.01.2026 (Annexure P-3), notifying inclusion of Village Manlog Badog in Gram Panchayat Darlaghat after its exclusion from Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog.

4. Immediately after issuance of the notification dated 27.01.2026, residents of Manlog Badog contacted Up-Pardhan of Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog, who issued certificate/communication dated 28.01.2026 (Annexure P-4), highlighting that day-to-day affairs of the residents of Village Manlog Badog were connected with residents of Village Hanuman Badog. It was further stated that Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog was about 2-3 km from Village Manlog Badog, whereas Gram Panchayat Darlaghat was located about 6-7 km away. Therefore, request was made to keep Village Manlog Badog in Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog.

5. Thereafter, Authorized Officer-cum-Block Development Officer, Kunihar, District Solan, issued notification dated 02.02.2026 (Annexure P-5) notifying determination/delimitation of seats of Gram Panchayats Sehrol, Badog, Hanuman Badog and Darlaghat situated in Development Block Kunihar and inviting objections from the public regarding delimitation proposal of constituencies and wards within one week from the date of publication of the notice.



6. On 03.02.2026, residents of Village Manlog Badog submitted their objections on the same lines as were submitted earlier against notification of reorganization/merger dated 18.12.2025.

7. Resolutions authorizing Rajesh Kumar, President of Nehru Yuva Club of Village Manlog-Badog and Sunita Sharma, President of Mahila Mandal of Village Manlog-Badog, to file present writ petition, have also been appended with this petition.

8. Certificate dated 30.01.2026 issued by Pardhan, Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog (Annexure P-7), has been placed on record, certifying that the distance of Panchayat Ghar of Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog from Village Manlog Badog through pedestrian path is about 2-3 km. A distance certificate issued by the Assistant Engineer, Darlaghat Sub-Division, HPPWD, has also been placed on record, wherein it has been certified that the distance from Darlaghat to Manlog Badog is about 6 km, i.e. 2 km on the NH road and 4 km on a rural road.

9. A report dated 31.01.2026 issued by the Patwari has also been placed on record, wherein it has been reported that, according to the revenue record, boundaries of Village Manlog Badog and Village Hanuman Badog are contiguous.



10. Another distance certificate issued by the Assistant Engineer, HPPWD, Sub-Division Arki, has also been placed on record, wherein it has been certified that the distance from Damlanaghatti to Hanuman Badog is 2 km and from Hanuman Badog to Manlog Badog is 2.5 km.

11. It has further been reported by concerned Junior Engineer that 2.5 km road from Hanuman Badog to Manlog Badog has been constructed by the Panchayat authorities, but the said road is not HPPWD road.

12. Upon filing of the petition on 10.02.2026, learned Vacation Judge adjourned the matter for 11.02.2026 to enable the respondents to have complete and latest instructions in the matter. On 11.02.2026, record was produced by the State and learned Additional Advocate General fairly conceded that the objections raised by the petitioners vide Annexure P-6 and submitted to the Block Development Officer, Kunihar, had not been decided till then. In view of the submissions made by learned Additional Advocate General, 10 days' time was granted to deal with objections in accordance with law and to place on record the decision, if any, taken on those objections, and the matter was adjourned to 23.02.2026.



13. On 23.02.2026, the matter was listed before Regular Division Bench, but was adjourned to enable learned Deputy Advocate General to remove objections for placing on record the reply, stated to have been filed on behalf of the respondents-State, and two days' time, as prayed, was granted to file rejoinder.

14. On 25.02.2026, pleadings were complete and it was noticed by the Court that in the petition as well as in the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners, it had been claimed that the distance between Village Manlog Badog and Hanuman Badog, on foot, was about 2 km via Panchayat Road was about 2.5 km and distance between Manlog Badog and Darlaghat was 6 km, whereas in the documents filed with the reply, i.e. the resolutions of the Gram Panchayat and Nehru Yuva Club, distance between Manlog Badog and Hanuman Badog, on foot, was mentioned as 4–6 km and, by road, it was 14 km. Therefore, the matter was adjourned for 02.03.2026 directing the respondents-State to clarify the issue with respect to the distance between the villages/Gram Panchayats in question.

15. On 02.03.2026, learned Advocate General placed on record instructions dated 28.02.2026 along with distance certificate issued by Assistant Engineer, wherein it was certified that distance



from Darlaghat to Manlog Badog was 6 km (2 km NH road and 4 km rural road) and the distance from Manlog Badog to Hanuman Badog via Piplughat and Damlanaghathi (motorable road) was 12.820 km.

16. Reply on behalf of respondents was filed on 20.02.2026 stating therein that entire process of reorganization of Panchayats had been carried out strictly under Section 3(2) of the Himachal Pradesh Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (in short, 'HP PR Act'), which empowers the competent authority to alter, merge, include or exclude any area in or from a Panchayat after inviting objections and suggestions from the inhabitants concerned. It was specifically stated that draft notification dated 18.12.2025 was duly published and objections were invited. However, no objections were filed by the petitioners within the time prescribed in the notification. After considering material on record, recommendations were forwarded and final notification dated 27.01.2026 was issued. According to the respondents, the exercise was based on administrative convenience, geographical considerations and public interest, and thus the lawful exercise of statutory power does not suffer from any legal infirmity. It was further stated that vide communication dated 20.12.2025, objections were invited, and publicity and circulation of the draft notification were made through the office of District Public



Relations Officer and daily newspapers, including *Amar Ujala*, wherein notice was published on 22.12.2025.

17. It has been submitted on behalf of respondents that, as per the record, objections from residents of Gram Panchayat Darlaghat were received and hearing in that regard was conducted on 29.12.2025, whereas no objections were filed by the petitioners within the time limit fixed in the notification dated 18.12.2025.

18. According to the reply, on the basis of recommendations regarding reorganization forwarded to the Panchayati Raj Department, final notification dated 27.01.2026 was issued by adopting a process of decision-making, which was not mechanical, but was preceded by consideration of objections at appropriate level.

19. It has been submitted that representation dated 28.01.2026 (Annexure P-4) was submitted after issuance of final notification dated 27.01.2026.

20. It has been further submitted that process of reorganization of Gram Panchayats under Section 3(2) of the HP PR Act and process of delimitation under the Himachal Pradesh Panchayati Raj (Election) Rules, 1994, are altogether different. After finalization of reorganization in present case vide notification dated 27.01.2026, draft delimitation proposal was published vide



notification dated 02.02.2026. Petitioners preferred objections against reorganization of Gram Panchayat, which had already been finalized, but not against the delimitation. Accordingly, Block Development Officer, Kunihar, disposed of the objections of the petitioners with observation that objections filed by the petitioners did not fall within purview of delimitation proceedings.

21. It was also stated in the reply that impugned reorganization was undertaken on the basis of earlier resolutions and requests, i.e. Resolution No.34 dated 06.01.2013 (Annexure R-III) and Resolution No.5 dated 21.11.2024 (Annexure R-IV), expressing willingness for inclusion of Ward/Village Manlog Badog in Gram Panchayat Darlaghat. On the basis of these resolutions, recommendations were forwarded through Block Development Officer/District Panchayat Officer, Solan, to Deputy Commissioner, Solan and further to Department of Panchayati Raj.

22. According to the respondents, Nehru Yuva Club Manlog Badog, vide communication dated 05.12.2024 (Annexure R-V), through its President, had also requested Pradhan of Gram Panchayat Darlaghat for inclusion of Village Manlog Badog in the said Gram Panchayat. The proposal was resubmitted vide letter dated 21.07.2025 to District Panchayat Officer for inclusion along



with a request from Mahila Mandal, Manlog Badog Manlog Badog and two other requests from Nehru Yuva Club Manlog Badog addressed to the Hon'ble Minister of Rural Development & Panchayati Raj and Hon'ble MLA, Arki, respectively, stating that the distance of the Headquarter of existing Gram Panchayat, Hanuman Badog, was approximately 14 km from their village, i.e. Manlog Badog, whereas the distance of their village from Darlaghat was only 3 km. It has been stated that impugned decision regarding reorganization was taken on the basis of population, geographical location, accessibility, infrastructure and administrative convenience.

23. Lastly, it has been stated that, in sequel to the order dated 11.02.2026 passed by this High Court, the objections raised vide Annexure P-6 were disposed of on 17.02.2026 by the BDO after granting opportunity of hearing to the petitioners with observation that the said objections were not maintainable in law in response to the notice of delimitation, as the objections were with respect to reorganization of the Panchayat.

24. In the rejoinder to reply, averments made in the petition have been reiterated with the submission that the documents relied upon for reorganization of the Panchayat pertain to the year 2013 and that the Secretary and the Pradhan of the concerned Gram



Panchayat, in connivance with each other, tried to mislead the authorities to exclude Village Manlog Badog from Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog with wrong statement that the distance of Manlog Badog from Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog is 14 km, whereas the actual distance between these villages is about 2–3 km.

25. It has been further submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that the certificate submitted by Ex-President of the Nehru Yuva Club was issued by him on his own without passing any resolution in this behalf and without discussing the matter with the members of the Nehru Yuva Club, and the resolution of the Mahila Mandal relied upon for bifurcation was also of the year 2019. It has further been stated that the notification dated 18.12.2025 was not properly published and affixed in the Panchayat concerned. However, immediately after knowing about the proposal for merger of Village Manlog Badog with Gram Panchayat Darlaghat, inhabitants of Manlog Badog filed objections before the competent authority on 30.12.2025. Those objections were never decided by the authorities till date, however, final notification was issued on 27.01.2026.

26. It has also been stated on behalf of petitioners that population of Village Manlog Badog is about 280, whereas the



population of Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog is about 1500 and that of Gram Panchayat Darlaghat is about 4500. Therefore, on account of population or otherwise, there was no necessity to exclude Village Manlog Badog from Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog and to include the same in Gram Panchayat Darlaghat.

27. It has been further submitted by learned counsel for petitioners that the land of the residents of Manlog Badog is also situated in Hanuman Badog and vice versa, and there exists *bartandari* between the residents of the two villages. It has been denied that the exercise undertaken by the authorities was based on administrative convenience, geographical considerations or public interest. Lastly, it has been submitted that the distance between the two contiguous villages, i.e. Manlog Badog and Hanuman Badog, cannot be measured by taking into consideration a road that first goes to Piplughat and Damlanaghathi and thereafter to Village Manlog Badog, particularly when there exists a direct Panchayat Road between the villages measuring about 2.5 km.

28. Learned Advocate General, justifying the decision of the respondents, submitted that delimitation of Wards and Panchayats cannot be challenged on the basis of distance between two villages. He further submitted that Nehru Yuva Club, a registered body, had



submitted an application dated 05.12.2024 to the Pradhan, Gram Panchayat Darlaghat, seeking inclusion of Village Manlog Badog in Gram Panchayat Darlaghat. A similar request was also made in Resolution No.5 of Gram Panchayat, Manlog Badog, passed on 21.11.2024, placed on record with the reply, wherein it was stated that the distance from Manlog Badog to the Headquarters of Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog by road was about 14 km, whereas the said Ward was about 4 km from Gram Panchayat Darlaghat.

29. It has been stated by learned Advocate General that challenge has been laid to notification dated 27.01.2026, but notification dated 02.02.2026 and order dated 17.02.2026 disposing of the objections dated 03.02.2026 have not been assailed. It has further been stated that due notice was given inviting objections, but no objections were preferred within the prescribed time. It has also been submitted that the respondents are trying to complete the delimitation process on or before 31.03.2026 so as to comply with the orders of the Court, as modified by the Apex Court, to complete the election process on or before 31.05.2026 by completing documentation in the month of March, 2026. Therefore, the present petition, at this belated stage, deserves to be dismissed.



30. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioners that proposed delimitation has been notified on the basis of the notification dated 27.01.2026, whereby Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog and Gram Panchayat Darlaghat have been reorganized. It is contended that once it is apparent that the reorganization is not based on the factual matrix, but is resulting grave prejudice to the inhabitants of Village Manlog Badog, the same deserves to be set aside. Consequently, all subsequent actions, including the delimitation of Gram Panchayats Darlaghat and Hanuman Badog, shall lose their enforceability and thus, deserve to be set aside accordingly.

31. Notification dated 28.02.2026 has also been placed on record by the petitioners, whereby division and reorganization for constituting and establishing new Gram Sabhas has been notified. It has been submitted that the respondents are still in process of reorganization of Gram Panchayats and delimitation process has not yet been finalized. Rather, the respondents are undertaking the process for division and reorganization of Gram Panchayats, and the delimitation is to be finalized by 31.03.2026. Therefore, interference of the Court at this stage, for genuine reasons, is not unwarranted, rather, it is warranted.



32. It has been further submitted on behalf of petitioners that from notification dated 27.01.2026, it is apparent that area described as Jungle Manlog has been kept in Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog, whereas Manlog Badog has been included in Gram Panchayat Darlaghat. It is contended that villagers of Manlog Badog have forestry and other local rights in Jungle Manlog, which contains forest area, and therefore the exclusion of Manlog Badog from Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog and its inclusion in Gram Panchayat Darlaghat is also against public interest for depriving residents of Manlog Badog from their legal rights.

33. Undoubtedly, after initiation of the election process, the Court must desist from interfering in the process of election, including delimitation of Wards and constituencies. However, at present, delimitation of Panchayati Raj Institutions in the State of Himachal Pradesh for conducting elections is in progress and, from the notification dated 28.02.2026, it is apparent that even reorganization and division of the areas of Gram Sabhas is still in progress and notifications have been issued recently inviting objections and suggestions with respect to such reorganization, particularly in District Solan, wherein the present Gram Panchayat is located.



34. In these circumstances, recent pronouncement of the Apex Court in ***Kishorchandra Chhanganlal Rathod vs. Union of India & Ors., (2024) 13 SCC 237***, is relevant to be referred to deal with the objections raised by the respondents, wherein after taking into consideration earlier judgments of the Apex Court titled as ***Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK) vs. Secretary, Governor's Secretariat & Ors., (2020) 6 SCC 548*** and ***State of Goa and Anr. vs. Fouziya Imtiaz Shaikh & Anr., (2021) 8 SCC 401***, it has been held as under:-

“5. We, however, do not approve the view taken by the High Court that the order of delimitation of constituencies, issued in exercise of statutory powers under the Delimitation Act, is entirely unsusceptible to the powers of judicial review exercisable under Article 226 of the Constitution. Although Article 329 undeniably restricts the scope of judicial scrutiny re: validity of any law relating to the delimitation of constituencies or the allotment of seats to such constituencies, it cannot be construed to have imposed for every action of delimitation exercise. If judicial intervention is deemed completely barred, citizens would not have any forum to plead their grievances, leaving them solely at the mercy of the Delimitation Commission. As a constitutional court and guardian of public interest, permitting such a scenario would be contrary to the Court's duties and the principle of separation of powers.

6. This understanding is supported by a three-judge bench decision of this Court in *Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam v. State of T.N., (2020) 6 SCC 548*, para 14, where the Court was called upon to interpret Articles 243O and 243ZG of the Constitution, which mirror the aforementioned Article 329. Rejecting the contention that these provisions place a complete bar on judicial intervention, it was noted that a constitutional Court can intervene for facilitating the elections or when a case for mala fide or arbitrary exercise of power is made out. Using this, the Court directed delimitation to be conducted for nine new districts. Recently, a three-judge bench of this Court in *State of Goa v. Fouziya Imtiaz Shaikh, (2021) 8 SCC 401*, para 67, affirmed the ratio of the above-cited decision while discussing principles on Article 329(a), and rejected the contention which sought to prove it as per incuriam.



7. Therefore, while the Courts shall always be guided by the settled principles regarding scope, ambit and limitations on the exercise of judicial review in delimitation matters, there is nothing that precludes them to check the validity of orders passed by Delimitation Commission on the touchstone of the Constitution. If the order is found to be manifestly arbitrary and irreconcilable to the constitutional values, the Court can grant the appropriate remedy to rectify the situation.

8. In order to prove that any kind of judicial intervention is fully prohibited, the respondents relied upon a Constitution Bench decision of this Court in Meghraj Kothari vs. Delimitation Commission and others, 1966 SCC Online SC 12. A closer examination of the aforementioned case, however, would show that the Court in that case restricted judicial intervention when the same would unnecessarily delay the election process. This is writ large from the following paragraph, where the Court explicated the reason behind adopting the hands-off approach:

“20. In our view, therefore, the objection to the delimitation of constituencies could only be entertained by the Commission before the date specified. Once the orders made by the Commission under Sections 8 and 9 were published in the Gazette of India and in the Official Gazettes of the States concerned, these matters could no longer be reagitated in a court of law. There seems to be very good reason behind such a provision. If the orders made under Sections 8 and 9 were not to be treated as final, the effect would be that any voter, if he so wished, could hold up an election indefinitely by questioning the delimitation of the constituencies from court to court. Section 10(2) of the Act clearly demonstrates the intention of the Legislature that the orders under Sections 8 and 9 published under Section 10(1) were to be treated as law which was not to be questioned in any court.”

[emphasis supplied]

9. Hence, the aforementioned judgement does not support the respondents' contention regarding complete restriction on judicial review. A constitutional court can undertake the exercise of judicial review within the limited sphere at an appropriate stage. 10. Consequently, the appeal is allowed in part, and para 3 of the impugned judgment—to the extent it held that there is a bar to challenge the order of delimitation of constituencies is set aside. The appellant, if so advised, may approach the High Court keeping in view the subsequent events. However, at present, no ground has been made out to interfere with the exercise of delimitation of constituencies and consequential reservation thereof, which was undertaken in the year 2006.”

35. The Panchayati Raj Institutions are grassroots institutions, where local inhabitants are governed at the local level.



For constitution of Panchayats and delimitation of Wards and Panchayat areas, factors such as personal relations, contiguity, distance and convenience are very much relevant. In the present case, averments that Village Manlog Badog and Hanuman Badog are contiguous to each other, having a distance of about 2–3 km on foot between main habitat of villages and are connected by a 2.5 km road constructed by the Panchayat, have not been disputed. Rather, learned Advocate General has tried to impress upon the Court by referring to the distance of 12-14 km between two villages, on the basis of copies of resolutions of the Gram Panchayat passed in 2024, an application of the Nehru Yuva Club submitted in the year 2024 and a request made in the year 2013 as well as certificate issued by HPPWD Officers.

36. It is also apt to note that, in response to order dated 25.02.2026, instructions dated 28.02.2026 were placed on record, wherein no response was made to the claim of the petitioners that distance between Manlog Badog and Hanuman Badog on foot is about 2–3 km and that there exists a Panchayat road measuring about 2.5 km between two villages. Instead, the distance between Manlog Badog and Hanuman Badog has been placed on record by calculating it via Piplughat and Damlanaghati as 12.820 km. Measurement of the distance between the two villages in this



manner is definitely unreasonable and irrational, and it amounts to measuring the distance between Himachal Bhawan and Haryana Bhawan, which are located at a distance of less than 500 mtrs., by measuring the same via Connaught Place or calculating distance between Shimla and Solan via Bilaspur. Undisputedly, Manlog Badog and Hanuman Badog are contiguous, whereas Piplughat and Damlanaghati are located in other directions, but the roads from Piplughat and Damlanaghati goes to both the villages, i.e. Manlog Badog and Hanuman Badog.

37. It is also relevant to record that the claim of petitioners that the population of Darlaghat is about 4500, the population of Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog is about 1500 and the population of Village Manlog Badog is about 280, has not been disputed at any point of time. Therefore, it is also unreasonable and irrational to add a village having a population of 280 to a Gram Panchayat having a population of 4500 by excluding it from Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog, the population whereof is about 1500. From the record, it appears that the actual distance between Manlog Badog and Hanuman Badog is about 2–3 km, whereas the distance of Darlaghat from Manlog Badog is about 6 km.



38. It is apt to record that learned Advocate General has submitted that distance cannot be ground for objecting the delimitation or reorganization, however, in present case, the sole basis for which reorganization has been carried out and delimitation has been notified, revolves around distance only, whereas other facts, i.e. geographical location, contiguity, population, have been ignored, that too on the basis of request made more than 10 years ago, whereas in interregnum, the connectivity between two villages stood improved for construction of Panchayat Road between two villages.

39. In view of above discussion, it is apparent that impugned action of the respondents in excluding Village Manlog Badog from Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog and including it in Gram Panchayat Darlaghat is manifestly arbitrary, unreasonable, irrational and contrary to the factual matrix on the spot. Therefore, we are of the considered opinion that the impugned notification deserves to be set aside.

40. Accordingly, the impugned notification dated 27.01.2026 (Annexure P-3) is set aside with all consequential effects to the extent it notifies inclusion of village Manlog Badog in Gram Panchayat Darlaghat, after exclusion of the said village Manlog Badog from Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog, along with proposed delimitation



of Gram Panchayats Darlaghat and Hanuman Badog to that extent vide notification dated 02.02.2026 (Annexure P-6).

41. Though the respondents have not placed on record any material indicating issuance of final notification in sequel to the proposed delimitation of Gram Panchayats Darlaghat and Hanuman Badog notified vide notification dated 02.02.2026, however, in case such notification has been issued during the interregnum, then in view of quashing and setting aside of the notification of reorganization of Gram Panchayat Hanuman Badog and Gram Panchayat Darlaghat, the said notification shall also not be sustainable. Accordingly, such notification, if any in existence, qua exclusion and inclusion of Village Manlog Badog referred *supra*, shall also stand quashed and set aside to that extent.

42. The respondents, especially respondent No.4, are directed to issue necessary notification regarding constitution and delimitation of Gram Panchayats Hanuman Badog and Darlaghat accordingly, immediately, latest within five days from today.

43. Before parting, it is also apt to record that we fail to understand that when 5 years' term of Panchayati Raj Institutions has already expired and respondents are bound by mandate of the Constitution, reiterated by Courts, including Apex Court, with direction to complete election process latest by 31.05.2026, then



why respondents are venturing in large scale reorganization and constitution of Wards/Panchayati Raj Institutions, which has not been done on time. Such commission on the part of State may cause to draw adverse inference about intention. Respondents-State should not undertake such exercise, which may be considered delaying tactic or procrastination, as due to paucity of time, decision taken in haste are leaving lacuna, intentional or unintentional, warranting scope of interreference in judicial review.

44. The petition is disposed of in above terms, so also the pending application(s), if any.

(Vivek Singh Thakur)
Judge

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge.

10th March, 2026
(Pardeep)