

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4117/2026

1. Smt. Santosh Kanwar W/o Virendra Singh, Aged About 72 Years, Resident Of Merta City, District Nagaur.
2. Ranveer Singh S/o Virendra Singh, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Merta City, District Nagaur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. Municipal Council, Merta City Through Its Executive Officer.
2. Additional Director, Local Self Department, Jaipur.
3. Mahendra Singh Mehta S/o Laxmichand Mehta, Resident Of 14, Nimbark Nagar, Dhavas Road, Prn Ajmer Road, Jaipur.
4. Arvind Singh S/o Vikram Singh, Resident Of Merta City, District Nagaur.
5. Ranjeet Singh S/o Vikram Singh, Resident Of Merta City, District Nagaur.
6. Ravindra Singh S/o Vikram Singh, Resident Of Merta City, District Nagaur.
7. Tanveer Singh S/o Virendra Singh, Resident Of Merta City, District Nagaur.
8. Anshuman Singh S/o Narendra Singh, Resident Of Merta City, District Nagaur.
9. Megha Kanwar D/o Narendra Singh, Resident Of Merta City, District Nagaur.
10. Surendra Singh S/o Mool Singh, Resident Of Merta City, District Nagaur.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Karan Joshi
For Respondent(s)	:	-

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP MATHUR

Order

24/02/2026

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Executive Officer, Municipal Council, Merta City, Nagaur issued notices dated 25.10.2023 and 27.12.2023 to the petitioner under Sections 194 and 245 of the Rajasthan Municipalities Act, alleging, inter alia, that he had raised construction of the building in question in contravention of the approved building plan.
2. Learned counsel further submitted that the aforesaid notices dated 25.10.2023 and 27.12.2023 were challenged by the petitioner by filing an appeal before the Additional Director, Department of Local Self Government, Jaipur, being Appeal No. 03/2023 titled "Arvind Singh & Ors. vs. Executive Officer, Municipal Council, Merta City, Nagaur."
3. Learned counsel further submitted that during the pendency of the said appeal, one Mr. Mahendra Singh filed an application under Order I Rule 10 CPC stating that he is a necessary and proper party to the litigation, as the aforesaid notices were allegedly issued against the petitioner on the basis of his complaints.
4. Learned counsel submitted that, as a matter of fact, the notices dated 25.10.2023 and 27.12.2023 nowhere indicate that they were issued on the basis of any complaint submitted by the said applicant. It was contended that Mahendra Singh has no locus standi under Order I Rule 10 CPC and, therefore, his application ought to have been rejected by the Appellate Authority. However, the Appellate Authority, vide order dated 27.01.2026, allowed the application filed by Mahendra Singh and impleaded him as a party in the proceedings pending before it.
5. The matter requires consideration.

6. Issue notice. Issue notice of the stay application as well.
7. In the meanwhile, the operation and effect of the order dated 27.01.2026 passed by the Additional Director, Department of Local Self Government, Jaipur, impleading Mahendra Singh as a party respondent in Appeal No. 03/2023, shall remain stayed.
8. However, the present order shall not preclude the Appellate Authority from proceeding with and finally adjudicating the matter independently, in accordance with law.

(KULDEEP MATHUR),J

255-sonia/-