
(2026) 03 P&H CK 1135

In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Case No : Civil Writ Petition No. 3827 Of 2026 (O&M)

Kamaljit Kaur And Others

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Punjab And Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 09-03-2026

Acts Referred:

Constitution Of India, 1950 — Article 226, 227
Punjab Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 — Section 24(3)

Citation : (2026) 03 P&H CK 1135

Hon'ble Judges : Harsh Bunker, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : R.S. Manhas

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Harsh Bunker J

1 Petition herein is, filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, inter alia, seeking a writ in the nature of Mandamus, directing the official respondents No.4 & 5 to give right to the petitioner No.1 for casting vote under sub-Section (3) of Section 24 of the Punjab Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 and to further remove the private respondents from the post of Member Panchayat, in view of their conduct in not supporting the development works of the village.

2. At this stage, Mr. Nirmaljit Singh Diwana, Sr. DAG, Punjab, appears on behalf of the respondents-State, in pursuance of the advance copy of paper book having already been supplied to him and submits that Block Development and Panchayat Officer, Block Jaimal Singh, District Pathankot had called the meeting of all the Members (including the petitioners) of the Gram Panchayat. However, it is submitted that the petitioners have not participated in the meeting.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners has disputed the abovesaid fact.

4. Learned State counsel further submits that another meeting has been

requisitioned for discussing the development works of Gram Panchayat Anoop Shahar for 18.03.2026 at 12.00 p.m. (noon). It is further submitted that, in case, the petitioners participate in the said meeting, necessary proceedings shall be carried out in accordance with law. He further submits that in case of equality of votes, the petitioner No.1 would also be permitted to exercise his right of casting vote in terms of Section 24(3) of Punjab Panchayati Raj Act, 1994.

4. 1 As regards the prayer of the petitioners that action be taken against the private respondents for not cooperating in the development works, it is submitted by learned State counsel that petitioners can raise such grievances before the concerned BDPO in the meeting scheduled for 18.03.2026 and necessary decision shall be taken by the concerned BDPO after affording due opportunity of hearing to all the concerned parties.

5. Keeping in view the aforesaid stand taken by the learned State counsel, no further order is required to be passed and the present writ petition stands disposed of, accordingly.

5. 1. It is made clear that, in case the petitioners do not participate in the meeting scheduled on 18.03.2026, concerned Authorities shall be at liberty to proceed further in the matter, in accordance with law.

6. All the pending application(s), if any, shall also stand closed.