

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

S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13929/2026

CNR: RJHC010638462026

URN: CW / 25383U / 2026

Smt. Gulab Begum @ Gulam Begum W/o Shri Bashir Khan, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Ward No.6, Bhadra, Tehsil Bhadra District Hanumangarh (Rajasthan).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary To The Govt., Department Of Local Self, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director, Local Self Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Hanumangarh.
4. Tehsildar, Revenue, Bhadra, Hanumangarh.
5. The Executive Officer, Municipal Board, Bhadra, District Hanumangarh.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Manjeet Godara

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Rajesh Panwar, AAG assisted by
Mr. Monal Chug

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MUKESH RAJPUROHIT

Order

08/07/2026

By way of the present civil writ petition, the petitioner has sought following reliefs :-

“In view of the facts and circumstances stated hereinabove, it is most humbly prayed that this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to:

i. issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, including a writ of certiorari, thereby quashing and setting aside the impugned survey report of land/report of boundary demarcation and identification dated 25.06.2026 (Annexure-7), prepared in pursuance of the order dated

25.06.2026 by the Tehsildar, Revenue, Bhadra, being wholly illegal, arbitrary, contradictory, and violative of the principles of natural justice;

ii. quash and set aside the impugned notices bearing Nos. 1273 (Annexure-10) and 1276 (Annexure-11) dated 29.06.2026, issued by the Executive Officer, Municipal Board, Bhadra, being illegal, unjustified, without jurisdiction, and based solely on an ex parte and illegal survey report;

iii. directed the respondents for not issuing any further proceeding for cancellations of the pattas which has been issued in favour of the petitioner in the garb of notices dated 29.06.2026.

iv. declare that the proceedings initiated by the respondents for cancellation of the Petitioner's pattas are illegal, arbitrary, malafide, and unsustainable in law, and consequently restrain the respondents from taking any coercive action against the Petitioner in pursuance of the impugned notices or the impugned survey report;

v. respondents be directed to maintain the status of the land as it existed prior to passing the survey report of land/report of boundary demarcation and identification dated 25.06.2026 in respect of land situated in Chak 8BHD, comprising Killa No. 24 of Murabba No. 27 and Killa No. 4 of Murabba No. 30, and to protect and not disturb the Petitioner's peaceful possession thereof;

vi. grant any other writ, order or direction which this Hon'ble Court may deem just, proper and expedient in the facts and circumstances of the present case;

vii. award costs of the present writ petition in favour of the Petitioner."

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as learned Additional Advocate General and carefully perused the material available on record.

After hearing arguments at length, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that he may be permitted to withdraw the present writ petition at this stage. However, he seeks liberty to file a comprehensive reply, specifically raising the issue relating to the limits of demarcation, as also before the competent authority of the respondent(s) assailing the demarcation proceedings.

Accordingly, the present civil writ petition is dismissed as not pressed, with liberty as prayed for.

The stay application, along with all pending application(s), if any, also stand dismissed accordingly.

It is, however, clarified that in the event the petitioner files the aforesaid reply and/or representation before the competent authority of the respondent(s), the same shall be duly considered and decided by the competent authority in accordance with law by passing a reasoned and speaking order, after affording the petitioner an opportunity of hearing.

It is further clarified that, in the event the petitioner remains aggrieved by the decision taken on such reply and/or representation, she shall be at liberty to take recourse of the remedy available to her under the law, if so advised.

(MUKESH RAJPUROHIT),J