

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 23412/2025

Ram Swaroop Kaswa S/o Hari Ram, Aged About 58 Years, R/o Village Harsolav, Tehsil Gotan, District Nagaur (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of The Panchyat Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Nagaur.
3. Vikas Adhikari, Panchyat Samiti Merta, District Nagaur.

----Respondents

Connected With

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 23361/2025

Mahendra S/o Amar, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Sata, Barmer, Rajasthan 344706

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. Divisional Commissioner, Barmer (Raj.).
3. The District Collector, Barmer, Rajasthan.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sedwa, Barmer, Rajasthan.
5. Gram Panchayat, Sata, Through Its Sarpanch, Office Of Gram Panchayat Samiti Sata, Tehsil Sedwa, District Barmer, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 199/2026

Girdhari Ram S/o Late Shri Chutra Ram, Aged About 73 Years, Resident Of Village Gulasar, Gram Panchayat Birloka, Tehsil Khinvsar, District Nagaur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary And Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Nagaur.
3. The Sub Division Officer, Khinvsar, District Nagaur.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 279/2026

1. Mahavir Singh S/o Shri Mukan Singh, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Chaura, District Jalore.
2. Talsa Ram S/o Shri Chhoga Ram, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Village Chaura, District Jalore.

3. Vana Ram S/o Shri Rayga Ram, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Village Chaura, District Jalore.
4. Narana Ram S/o Shri Hema Ram, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Village Chaura, District Jalore.
5. Jora Ram S/o Shri Naga Ram, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Village Chaura, District Jalore.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayat Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, District - Jalore (Raj.)
3. The Tehsildar, Sanchoe, District - Jalore (Raj.)
4. The Gram Panchayat Chora, Panchayat Samiti Sanchoe, District Jalore Through Its Sarpanch.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 346/2026

1. Girdhari Lal S/o Sh. Panna Ram, Aged About 68 Years, Resident Of Village Dhani Tetarwal, Tehsil Sardarshahar, District Churu (Rajasthan).
2. Gudan Ram S/o Sh. Ravat Ram, Aged About 66 Years, Resident Of Village Dhani Tetarwal, Tehsil Sardarshahar, District Churu (Rajasthan).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Churu.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sardarshahar, District Churu.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 360/2026

1. Sayed Akhtar S/o Shri Machchu Khan, Aged About 47 Years, Resident Of Karakwal, Tehsil Merta District Nagaur.
2. Munir Khan Joya S/o Shri Umar Khan, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Karakwal, Tehsil Merta District Nagaur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector Cum District Election Officer, Nagaur.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Merta, District Nagaur.
4. Shri Laxman Ram, Mla, Merta District Nagaur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 426/2026

1. Likhma Ram S/o Shri Narayan Ram, Aged About 64 Years, Resident Of Village Suratpura, Tehsil Makrana, District Deedwana- Kuchaman, Rajasthan.
2. Hari Singh S/o Shri Indra Dan, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Suratpura, Tehsil Makrana, District Deedwana- Kuchaman, Rajasthan.
3. Bajrang Lal S/o Shri Lalu Ram, Aged About 51 Years, Resident Of Village Suratpura, Tehsil Makrana, District Deedwana- Kuchaman, Rajasthan.
4. Kana Ram S/o Shri Ganesha Ram, Aged About 47 Years, Resident Of Village Suratpura, Tehsil Makrana, District Deedwana- Kuchaman, Rajasthan.
5. Bhanwara Ram S/o Shri Pema Ram Jat, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village Suratpura, Tehsil Makrana, District Deedwana- Kuchaman, Rajasthan.
6. Jetha Ram S/o Shri Pusa Ram Prajapat, Aged About 68 Years, Resident Of Village Suratpura, Tehsil Makrana, District Deedwana- Kuchaman, Rajasthan.
7. Peetha Ram S/o Shri Rugha Ram Jat, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village Suratpura, Tehsil Makrana, District Deedwana- Kuchaman, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Election Officer Cum District Collector, Deedwana- Kuchaman, Rajasthan.
4. Sub Divisional Officer (Sdo), Makrana, District Deedwana- Kuchaman, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 497/2026

1. Devaram Choudhary S/o Shri Shankar Lal Choudhary, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Gram- Khor, Post- Jalampur, Tehsil And District Chittorgarh.
2. Charan Singh S/o Shri Shankar Lal, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Nayi Abadi Khor, Post- Jalampur, Tehsil And District Chittorgarh.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj,

Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariate, Jaipur.

2. The Secretary (Administrative) And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj (Department Of Panchayati Raj), Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Chittorgarh.
4. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariate, Jaipur.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Tehsil- Chittorgarh, District- Chittorgarh.
6. The Tehsildar (Land Record), Tehsil- Chittorgarh, District- Chittorgarh.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 522/2026

1. Ajit Singh Charan S/o Shri Himmat Singh Ji, Aged About 65 Years, Residents Of Village Jaitpura, Tehsil Asind, District Bhilwara, Rajasthan.
2. Indarlal S/o Radheyshyam Dholi, Aged About 59 Years, Residents Of Village Jaitpura, Tehsil Asind, District Bhilwara, Rajasthan.
3. Shyamlal Balai S/o Shri Chunnilal Blai Ji, Aged About 42 Years, Residents Of Village Jaitpura, Tehsil Asind, District Bhilwara, Rajasthan.
4. Shivlal Suthar S/o Shri Sohanlal Ji, Aged About 55 Years, Residents Of Village Jaitpura, Tehsil Asind, District Bhilwara, Rajasthan.
5. Kanhaiyalal Gurjar S/o Shri Bhiga Ji, Aged About 50 Years, Residents Of Village Jaitpura, Tehsil Asind, District Bhilwara, Rajasthan.
6. Nanuram Balai S/o Shri Biramlal Ji, Aged About 37 Years, Residents Of Village Jaitpura, Tehsil Asind, District Bhilwara, Rajasthan.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat Jaipur.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Bhilwara.
4. The District Collector, Bhilwara.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Tehsil Asind District Bhilwara.
6. The Tehsildar, Tehsil Asind District Bhilwara.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 565/2026

Ram Swaroop Kaswa S/o Hari Ram, Aged About 58 Years, R/o Village Harsolav, Tehsil Gotan, District Nagaur (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of The Panchayat Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Nagaur.
3. Vikas Adhikari, Panchayat Samiti Merta, District Nagaur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 763/2026

1. Sahi Nath S/o Prem Nath, Aged About 54 Years, Resident Of Patamdesar, District Churu Rajasthan.
2. Birbal Joshi S/o Aasu Ram, Aged About 50 Years, Patamdesar, District Churu Rajasthan.
3. Tilokaram S/o Ganesha Ram, Aged About 54 Years, Patamdesar, District Churu Rajasthan.
4. Mahaveer Prasad S/o Lekh Ram, Aged About 49 Years, Patamdesar, District Churu Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government Commissioner, Rural Development Panchayati Raj Department (Panchayati Raj), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, District Churu, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 926/2026

Kalwant Singh S/o Sh. Darshan Singh, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 7, 31 MI, Ganganagar.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Department Of Revenue (Group-I), Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Through Joint Secretary.
3. District Collector, Ganganagar.
4. The Divisional Commissioner, Ganganagar.
5. Tehsildar (Land Revenue), Ganganagar.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1133/2026

1. Ramswaroop S/o Shri Nandram, Aged About 59 Years, Resident Of Gram Saarsar, Gram Panchayat- Saarsar, Tehsil- Sardarshahar, District Churu, 331402.

2. Mamraj Saran S/o Shri Nandram Saran, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Gram- Saarsar, Gram Panchayat - Saarsar, Tehsil- Sardarshahar, District- Churu, 331402.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary (Administrative) And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj (Department Of Panchayati Raj), Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Churu.
4. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Tehsil- Sardarshahar, District- Churu.
6. The Tehsildar, (Land Record), Tehsil- Sardarshahar, District- Churu.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1492/2026

1. Hara Ram S/o Taja Ram, Aged About 54 Years, Resident Of Village Solankiya Talla, Tehsil Shergarh, District Jodhpur.
2. Ishe Khan S/o Late Hazi Khan, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of Village Suryodaya Nagar, Tehsil Shergarh, District Jodhpur.
3. Kanwrajdan S/o Vijaydan, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Village Pugalia, Tehsil Shergarh, District Jodhpur.
4. Pempa Ram S/o Kheta Ram, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Village Santoshnathpura, Tehsil Shergarh, District Jodhpur.
5. Mana Ram S/o Hari Ram, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Village Dashania, Tehsil Shergarh, District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, The Secretary And Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2780/2026

1. Saddam Husain S/o Shri Hanif Khan, Aged About 30 Years, R/o 30, Teliyon Ka Bas, Nandiya Kalan, Tehsil Baori, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
2. Chetan Ram S/o Shri Naru Ram, Aged About 57 Years, R/

o Macharo Ki Dhaniyan, Nandiya Kalan, Tehsil Baori,
District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Deputy Secretary And Deputy Commissioner (First), Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Jodhpur.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Baori, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1825/2026

1. Chenpal Singh S/o Shri Prithvi Singh, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Raghunathpura, Tehsil Nava, District Deedwana Kuchaman (Raj.).
2. Chennaram S/o Shri Chatraram, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Raghunathpura, Tehsil Nava, District Deedwana Kuchaman (Raj.).
3. Hanuman Ram S/o Shri Sheoram, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Raghunathpura, Tehsil Nava, District Deedwana Kuchaman (Raj.).
4. Mannaram S/o Shri Gordhanram, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Devnagar, Tehsil Nava, District Deedwana Kuchaman.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).
3. The Deputy Commissioner Cum Deputy Secretary (First), Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).
4. The District Collector, Deedwana Kuchaman (Raj.).
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Deedwanakuchaman (Raj.).
6. The Sub Divisional Officer, Tehsil Nava, District Deedwana Kuchaman (Raj.).
7. The Tehsildar, Tehsil Nava, District Deedwana Kuchaman (Raj.).

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1829/2026

1. Om Prakash S/o Shri Ramchandra, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Village 3 Jm, 20 Lm, 15 Lm, District Sriganganagar (Rajasthan).
2. Kulwant Singh S/o Shri Chanan Singh, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of 3 Jm, 20 Lm, District Sriganganagar (Rajasthan).
3. Balvinder Singh S/o Shri Nakshatra Singh, Aged About 51 Years, Resident Of Village 3 Jm, 15 Lm, District Sriganganagar (Rajasthan).
4. Dalip Kumar S/o Shri Jai Singh, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 1 P.o, 15 Lm, 3 Jm, Sriganganagar (Rajasthan).
5. Angad Kumar S/o Shri Devi Lal, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Village 3 Jm, 20 Lm, 15 Lm, District Sriganganagar (Rajasthan.).
6. Ramchand S/o Shri Shrwam Ram, Aged About 75 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 2, Village Chak 3 Jm, 15 Lm, Sriganganagar (Rajasthan).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Rajasthan).
2. The Secretary-Cum-Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Rajasthan).
3. The District Election-Cum-District Collector, Sriganganagar (Rajasthan).
4. The Sub Divisional Magistrate, Anoopgarh, District Sriganganagar (Rajasthan).
5. The Gram Panchayat, Chak 1 Nwm Through Its Administrator-Cum-Secretary, Tehsil Anoopgarh, District Sri Ganganagar (Rajasthan).
6. The Gram Panchayat, Chak 15 Lm Through Its Administrator-Cum-Secretary, Tehsil Anoopgarh, District Sri Ganganagar (Rajasthan).

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 791/2026

1. Mukand Singh Mehra S/o Harnek Singh Mehra, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Raisinghnagar, 5 Ksd-B, Ganganagar,rajasthan-335051.
2. Ram Kumar S/o Hajari Ram, Aged About 54 Years, R/o



Raisinghnagar, 5 Ksd-B, Ganganagar,rajasthan-335051.

3. Amar Singh S/o Vijay Singh, Aged About 62 Years, R/o 80, 5 K.s.d.b, Tehsil Raisinghnagar, Dist Shriganganagar, Rajasthan- 335051.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary To The Government, Rural Development Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Shri Ganganagar.

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	: Mr. GR Punia, Sr. Advocate assisted by Mr. Rajesh Punia Mr. Moti Singh with Mr. Siddharth Mewara Mr. Gaurav Ranka for Mr. Muktesh Maheshwari Mr. Foja Ram Mr. Sanjay Rewar Mr. KR Saharan Mr. Manish Patel Mr. Mohit Sharma Mr. Mohit Chaudhary Mr. Jai Kishan Bhaiya Mr. Rajat Rajpurohit for Mr. Sajjan Singh Mr. Lakshya Singh Udawat Mr. Symer Singh Gaur Mr. Jitendra Singh Bhanwariya Mr. Kirta Ram Meghwal Dr. Ashok Choudhary Mr. Ravindra Kumar Acharya Mr. Avinash Acharya Mr. Devendra Singh Thind Mr. Amit Kumar Sonika Ms. Laxmi Rathore
For Respondent(s)	: Mr. I.R. Choudhary, AAG with Mr. Pawan Bharti, Mr. Kuldeep Singh Solankiya Mr. Rohit Choudhary Ms. Richa Bohra & Ms. Bhawna Dave Mr. Kunal Upadhyay Mr. Ram Niwas Haniya Mr. Arpit Samariya, AAAG for Mr. Nathu Singh Rathore, AAG

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP SHAH

Judgment

1. Date of conclusion of arguments	18.03.2026, 25.03.2026 & 27.03.2026
2. Date on which judgment was reserved	18.03.2026, 25.03.2026 & 27.03.2026
3. Whether the full judgment or only the operative part is pronounced:	Full Judgment
4. Date of pronouncement	13.04.2026

1. Delimitation and reorganization of Panchayati Raj Institutions constitute a vital component of grassroots democratic governance, having a direct bearing on representation, administrative convenience and effective implementation of local self-government envisaged under Part IX of the Constitution of India. The process, by its very nature, involves evaluation of multiple factors such as population, geographical contiguity, accessibility and availability of infrastructure, and thus assumes considerable significance in ensuring balanced and functional decentralization.

1.1. These writ petitions, though arising out of varying factual backgrounds, were heard together, as they involve common questions pertaining to the validity of notifications issued in the course of such delimitation and reorganization exercise. Since the issues involved are substantially overlapping and interconnected, all the petitions are being decided by this common order.

1.2. It is also pertinent to note that the present batch of writ petitions comprises multiple matters arising out of the delimitation and reorganization exercise of Panchayati Raj Institutions undertaken by the State Government. D.B. Civil Writ Petition Nos.

23412/2025, 23361/2025, 199/2026, 279/2026, 346/2026, 360/2026, 426/2026, 497/2026, 522/2026, 565/2026, 763/2026, 926/2026, 1133/2026, 1492/2026 and 2780/2026 were reserved for orders on 18.03.2026; D.B. Civil Writ Petition Nos. 1825/2026 and 1829/2026 were reserved subsequently on 25.03.2026; and D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 791/2026 was reserved thereafter on 27.03.2026. Since all the aforesaid writ petitions arise from the same delimitation exercise and involve common and overlapping questions of fact and law, they were heard analogously and are being decided together by this common order for the sake of convenience, judicial economy and to ensure consistency in adjudication.

2. The petitioners, being aggrieved of the aforesaid exercise of delimitation and reorganization undertaken by the State Government, have preferred the present batch of writ petitions seeking quashing and setting aside the notifications dated 20/21.11.2025, 28.12.2025 and 31.12.2025, issued by the State Government under the provisions of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994, whereby various Panchayati Raj Institutions, including Gram Panchayats and Panchayat Samitis, have been created, altered, reconstituted, substituted, or their names and headquarters modified, to the extent such actions are alleged to have been undertaken without following the statutory procedure, without inviting or considering objections, in deviation from the notified proposals, in violation of applicable guidelines, or in disregard of subsisting judicial orders.

2.1. The petitions further seek consequential directions for restoration of the position as emerging from the duly notified proposals and/or the final notification dated 20/21.11.2025, and for restraining the respondents from effecting any alteration in the constitution, limits, name or headquarters of Panchayati Raj Institutions except in accordance with law, particularly in compliance with the requirements of Sections 9, 10 and 101 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 and the applicable policy guidelines.

2.2. The petitions also seek declaration that the impugned actions are arbitrary, unreasonable and violative of the principles of natural justice and the mandate of Articles 14 and 243 of the Constitution of India, along with all consequential and ancillary reliefs.

3. Briefly stated, the facts giving rise to the present batch of writ petitions are that the State Government initiated an exercise for reorganization and delimitation of Panchayati Raj Institutions pursuant to policy/guidelines issued in the year 2025, whereunder the District Collectors were required to prepare proposals, invite objections from the public and submit recommendations for consideration at the State level. In furtherance thereof, proposals were published, objections were invited and considered, and thereafter notifications dated 20/21.11.2025 came to be issued constituting, altering or reconstituting various Gram Panchayats and Panchayat Samitis.

3.1. In certain cases, the grievance of the petitioners is that the final notification departed from the original proposal, inasmuch as villages or areas proposed to be included in one Panchayat Samiti or Gram Panchayat were ultimately included in a different unit, without any fresh notice or opportunity of objection.

3.2. In another set of cases, the petitioners have assailed the subsequent notifications dated 28.12.2025 and 31.12.2025, contending that after culmination of the process and issuance of the final notification, further alterations were carried out by way of amendments/corrigenda, including change of name, inclusion or exclusion of villages, alteration of headquarters and even substitution or creation of new Panchayats, without undertaking any fresh exercise of inviting objections.

3.3. In some of the petitions, it is alleged that the impugned actions have been taken despite subsisting interim orders passed by this Court in earlier proceedings, and that the subsequent notifications indirectly seek to give effect to matters which were already under judicial consideration.

3.4. Certain petitioners have also raised grievance that though objections were invited, the same were not duly considered, and the final decision has been taken without assigning reasons, allegedly ignoring relevant factors such as distance, connectivity, population, availability of infrastructure and administrative convenience.

3.5. In a few cases, it is further contended that the impugned actions are contrary to the policy guidelines issued by the State

Government itself, and that the deviations effected in the final or subsequent notifications are neither supported by the material on record nor preceded by any discernible decision-making process.

3.6. Thus, though the individual facts vary from case to case, the core challenge in the present batch revolves around the legality of the process adopted by the State in issuing the impugned notifications, particularly with regard to deviation from proposals, post-notification alterations, alleged non-consideration of objections, and the manner in which the reorganization exercise has been carried out.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that:

4.1. The entire exercise undertaken by the State Government in issuing the impugned notifications is vitiated for non-compliance of the mandatory statutory scheme under Sections 9, 10 and 101 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994, which unequivocally requires publication of proposal, invitation of objections, consideration thereof and only thereafter issuance of final notification. It is submitted that in a large number of cases, the impugned actions have been taken without issuance of any prior notice or without affording opportunity to the affected inhabitants, thereby rendering the action void ab initio.

4.2. Learned counsel submitted that the foundation of the entire exercise lies in the proposal dated 07.04.2025, pursuant to which objections were invited from the public. However, the final notifications have travelled far beyond the scope of such proposals, inasmuch as villages and areas which were never part

of the proposal, or were proposed to be included in a different Panchayat, have ultimately been included in entirely different Gram Panchayats or Panchayat Samitis, without any fresh process. It is contended that such deviation strikes at the very root of the statutory requirement and defeats the purpose of inviting objections.

4.3. It is further submitted that once the process culminated in the issuance of final notification dated 20/21.11.2025, the State Government became functus officio to the extent of that exercise, and any further alteration could only have been made by initiating a fresh exercise in accordance with law. However, the subsequent notifications dated 28.12.2025 and 31.12.2025 have been issued making substantive and far-reaching changes, including alteration of territorial limits, change of name of Panchayats, shifting of headquarters, substitution of one Panchayat by another and even creation of entirely new Panchayats.

4.4. Learned counsel vehemently submitted that such subsequent actions have been sought to be justified under the garb of "corrigendum" or "clerical error", whereas in reality, they amount to fresh delimitation and reorganization, which is impermissible without following the complete statutory procedure. It is submitted that the power to correct clerical or typographical errors cannot be stretched to undo a concluded exercise or to re-write the delimitation itself.

4.5. It is also contended that in certain petitions, the impugned actions have been taken despite subsisting interim orders passed

by this Court, whereby the authorities were restrained from proceeding further in respect of the concerned subject matter. It is submitted that the subsequent notifications, though couched in a different form, seek to indirectly achieve what could not be done directly, and thus amount to an attempt to overreach the process of the Court.

4.6. Learned counsel further submitted that even in cases where objections were invited, the same have been mechanically dealt with or not considered at all, and no reasoned decision-making process is discernible from the record. It is submitted that the requirement of inviting objections is not an empty formality, but entails a corresponding duty to apply mind to the objections and take an informed decision, which is conspicuously absent in the present cases.

4.7. It is also urged that the impugned decisions suffer from manifest arbitrariness and non-application of mind, inasmuch as relevant factors such as population strength, geographical contiguity, distance between villages, accessibility, availability of infrastructure and administrative convenience have been ignored, and in several instances, villages have been attached to distant or non-contiguous Panchayats, leading to serious practical difficulties for the inhabitants.

4.8. Learned counsel further submitted that the impugned actions are also in the teeth of the policy guidelines issued by the State Government itself, particularly the guidelines dated 10.01.2025, which prescribe the criteria for creation, alteration and

determination of headquarters of Panchayats. It is submitted that deviation from such policy, without any recorded justification, renders the decision arbitrary and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

4.9. It is thus submitted that the impugned notifications, to the extent they suffer from the aforesaid infirmities, are unsustainable in law, and deserve to be quashed, with a direction to the respondents to adhere to the statutory scheme and restore the position as it existed upon completion of the lawful process culminating in the notification dated 20/21.11.2025.

5. Learned counsel for the respondents, while opposing the present batch of writ petitions, advanced elaborate submissions, which, in essence, are as follows:

5.1. Learned counsel, at the outset, questioned the very maintainability of the writ petitions, contending that the challenge laid by the petitioners is directed against an exercise of delimitation and reorganization of Panchayati Raj Institutions, which stands protected from judicial interference by virtue of the constitutional scheme contained under Articles 243-O and 243-ZG of the Constitution of India, read with Section 117 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994. It is submitted that once the process culminates in a final notification, the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 stands severely circumscribed.

5.2. Learned counsel submitted that the State Government has undertaken a comprehensive and structured exercise of reorganization, pursuant to policy decisions and guidelines issued

in the year 2025, wherein District Collectors were entrusted with the task of preparing proposals, inviting objections and forwarding recommendations. It is urged that the process was carried out in a multi-tiered manner, involving consideration at the district level as well as scrutiny by a High-Level Committee at the State level, thereby ensuring due application of mind at every stage.

5.3. It is further submitted that the allegations of the petitioners regarding absence of notice or non-consideration of objections are unfounded, inasmuch as public notices were duly issued, objections were invited and considered, and the final decisions were taken after evaluating relevant parameters such as population, geographical contiguity, administrative feasibility and overall governance considerations. It is contended that mere non-acceptance of objections does not imply non-consideration.

5.4. Learned counsel emphasized that the process of delimitation is in the nature of legislative or conditional legislative function, which carries a presumption of validity and is ordinarily immune from judicial review.

5.5. It is further submitted that this legal position has been consistently followed by this Hon'ble Court in a catena of decisions, including ***Sunil Jangid & Ors. v. State of Rajasthan (D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 988/2026 and other connected matters decided on 21.02.2026)***, wherein a batch of writ petitions raising similar challenges to the delimitation exercise came to be dismissed, and such view has attained finality upon affirmation by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

5.6. Learned counsel has also drawn the attention of this Court to the judgment rendered by the Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court in ***Mamta v. State of Rajasthan (D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 14354/2019 and other connected matters decided on 26.02.2026)***, wherein a large number of writ petitions arising out of restructuring of Panchayati Raj institutions were adjudicated together and dismissed, reiterating that such policy-driven administrative decisions warrant minimal judicial interference.

5.7. Learned counsel further placed strong reliance upon the orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Villagers of Revenue Village Singhaniya & Anr. v. State of Rajasthan & Ors. (Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 34/2026 [Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 14-11-2025 in DBCWP No. 8192/2025 passed by the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan at Jaipur] decided on 05.01.2026)***, ***Jai Singh & Anr. v. State of Rajasthan & Ors. (Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).4977/2026 [Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 21-01-2026 in DBCWP No.792/2026 passed by the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan at Jaipur] decided on 16.02.2026)*** and ***Alkesh v. State of Rajasthan & Ors. (Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s).8148/2026 [Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 21-01-2026 in DBCWP No.299/2026 passed by the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan at Jaipur] decided on 09.03.2026)***, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court, while dealing with challenges arising out

of the very same delimitation exercise, has declined to interfere and has observed that no infringement of any constitutional or legally vested right is made out, while also granting liberty to the aggrieved parties to approach the competent authority for redressal of their grievances.

5.8. Learned counsel further submitted that it is a settled proposition of law that no individual or group of villagers has a vested right to claim inclusion in a particular Gram Panchayat or Panchayat Samiti, and the delimitation exercise, being policy-oriented, cannot be tested on the touchstone of individual convenience or preference.

5.9. With regard to the challenge based on alleged violation of guidelines, it is submitted that the guidelines relied upon by the petitioners are merely directory in nature, meant to guide administrative discretion, and do not create enforceable rights. It is urged that unless a clear case of arbitrariness or mala fide is demonstrated, deviation, if any, cannot invalidate the entire exercise.

5.10. Learned counsel also addressed the grievance regarding the subsequent notifications dated 28.12.2025 and 31.12.2025, contending that the same are in the nature of corrigenda, issued to rectify clerical errors, inadvertent omissions and minor inconsistencies arising in the earlier notifications, including corrections based on representations received from stakeholders. It is submitted that such corrections do not amount to a fresh exercise of delimitation.

5.11. It is further submitted that the doctrine of functus officio has no application in the present context, as the State retains the authority to effect necessary corrections and clarifications in the notification till the commencement of the election process, particularly where such corrections are intended to remove ambiguities and facilitate smooth conduct of elections.

5.12. Learned counsel emphasized that the impugned notifications and subsequent corrigenda have been issued prior to the commencement of the election process and within the time frame fixed, and therefore the same cannot be said to be without jurisdiction.

5.13. It is also contended that the election process has already been set in motion, voter lists have been finalized and wards have been constituted, and any interference at this stage would seriously disrupt the electoral process and defeat the constitutional mandate of timely elections to local bodies.

5.14. Learned counsel thus submitted that even assuming limited judicial review is available, the same is confined only to cases of patent lack of jurisdiction, mala fides or manifest arbitrariness, none of which are made out in the present batch of cases.

5.15. In light of the aforesaid submissions, it is urged that the impugned notifications represent a lawful exercise of statutory power undertaken in public interest, and the present writ petitions, being devoid of merit and barred by constitutional limitations, deserve to be dismissed.

6. Heard counsel for the parties, perused the material available on record and the judgments cited at the Bar.

6.1. This Court observes that the controversy involved in the present batch of writ petitions pertains to the delimitation and reorganization of Panchayati Raj Institutions undertaken by the State Government, including the issuance of notifications dated 20/21.11.2025, 28.12.2025 and 31.12.2025.

6.2. This Court further observes that though the petitioners have raised multiple grounds, including deviation from proposals, post-notification alterations, non-consideration of objections, violation of interim orders and alleged departure from policy guidelines, the core issue relating to validity of such delimitation exercise is no longer res integra.

6.3. This Court finds that an identical set of issues arising out of the very same delimitation exercise has already been considered and conclusively decided by a Coordinate Bench of this Hon'ble Court in **Mamta v. State of Rajasthan & Ors. (D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 14354/2019 decided on 26.02.2026)**.

6.4. This Court further finds that the Coordinate Bench in **Mamta (supra)**, after considering the entire spectrum of such challenges, has declined to interfere and has upheld the validity of the delimitation exercise, while also emphasizing that such matters fall within the domain of administrative discretion and policy.

6.5. This Court finds that despite elaborate submissions, learned counsel for the petitioners have not been able to demonstrate any distinguishing feature, either on facts or in law, so as to take the

present batch of cases outside the ambit of the judgment in **Mamta (supra)** and the binding precedents noticed therein.

6.6. This Court observes that judicial discipline requires that a Coordinate Bench follow an earlier judgment on identical issues unless there exist compelling reasons to take a different view. This Court thus finds that the present batch of writ petitions is squarely covered by the judgment in **Mamta (supra)** and the consistent line of precedents, and therefore does not warrant any independent or fresh adjudication.

6.7. This Court further observes that the scope of judicial review in matters of delimitation is extremely limited and confined to cases of manifest arbitrariness, mala fide exercise of power or jurisdictional error, none of which have been established in the present cases.

7. Consequently, the present batch of writ petitions stands **dismissed**. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SANDEEP SHAH),J

(DR.PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI),J

SKant/-