

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

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2605/2026

Sandeep Soni S/o Sh. Ratan Lal Soni, Aged About 46 Years, R/o
Ward No. 22, Hanumangarh Town, Hanumangarh (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Public Health Engineering Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Municipal Council, Hanumangarh Through Its Commissioner.
3. The District Collector, Hanumangarh (Raj.).
4. Archit Aggarwal S/o Suresh Kumar, Authorized Person For Ganpati Estate Emporio, Having Registered Office At Ward No. 18, Saraffon Ka Mouhalla, Near Lata Bhawan, Hanumagarh Town, Hanumangarh Rajasthan.

----Respondents

Connected With

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1171/2020

Sandeep Soni S/o Shri Ratan Lal Soni, Aged About 35 Years, By Caste Soni, Resident Of Ward No. 22, New Ward No. 25, Sindhi Mohalla, Hanumangarh Town, Tehsil And District Hanumangarh.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Director, Department Of Local Bodies, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Hanumangarh.
3. The Commissioner, Municipal Council, Hanumangarh.
4. Town Planner, Bikaner.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3191/2021

Sandeep Soni S/o Shri Ratan Lal Soni, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 22, Hanumangarh Town, District Hanumangarh. Mobile No. 9610212388.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Local Self Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Director, Local Self Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. Municipal Council, Hanumangarh Through Its Commissioner.

4. Jai Prakash S/o Shri Jagnath, Resident Of Plot No. 259, Mini Secretariat, Hanumangarh.
5. Ramdas Juneja S/o Shri Ramrang Juneja, By Caste Arora, C/o Hollu Dream School, Near Khalsa School, Sector 12, Hanumangarh.
6. Mal Chand Soni S/o Shri Shiv Lal Soni, By Caste Soni, Resident Of Ward No. 18, Pilibanga, District Hanumangarh.
7. Kumari Vandana D/o Shri Ganesh Raj Bansal, By Caste Agarwal, C/o Punjab Electric Store Sanjay Gandhi Chowk, Ratia, District Hanumangarh.
8. Manoj Kumar S/o Shri Devdas, Resident Of Civil Lines Near Rajiv Gandhi Stadium North Side, Hanumangarh.
9. Sandeep Kumar S/o Shri Shiv Bhagwan, By Caste Agarwal, House No. 68 Bansal Villa, Suncity Tibbi Road, Hanumangarh.
10. Lal Chand S/o Shri Vishanu Nath, By Caste Agarwal, Resident Of Plot No. C-252, Mini Secretariat, Hanumangarh.
11. Rohit Kumar S/o Shri Puran Mal Verma, Resident Of Ward No. 22, Opp. Kirayana Bhawan Mandir, 6 Number Chungi Road, Hanumangarh Town 335513.
12. Rajendra Soni S/o Shri Mangal Ram, Resident Of Gyan Singh Colony Rawatsar Road, Hanumangarh Town-335513.
13. Gajanand S/o Shri Ram Chandra Sharma, Resident Of Near House Of Maheshwari Hari Mohan Prasad Durga Colony, Hanumangarh.
14. Manoj Kumar S/o Shri Dev Raj, Resident Of Civil Line Near Rajiv Gandhi Stadium North Side, Hanumangarh.
15. Manoj Kumar S/o Shri Dev Raj, Resident Of Civil Line Near Rajiv Gandhi Stadium North Side, Hanumangarh.
16. Bhagwan Das S/o Shri Murlidhar, Resident Of Plot No. 129, Sector No. 11A, Opp. Raj Housing Board, Sector 8, Suratgarh Road, Hanumangarh Junction.
17. Vandana D/o Shri Ganesh Raj Bansal, By Caste Agarwal, Resident Of C/o Punjab Electric Store, Sanjay Gandhi Chowk Ratia, District Fatehabad (Haryana).
18. Kanta Devi W/o Shri Devdas, Resident Of Near Lal Chowk, Ganganagar Road, Nai Mandi, Hanumangarh Junction.
19. Shashi Goyal W/o Shri Sushil Kumar, Resident Of Sector No. 6 Mandi, Plot No. 171 Rai Housing Board, Hanumangarh.
20. Sandeep Kumar S/o Shri Shiv Bhagwan, By Caste

Agarwal, House No. 68 Bansal Villa, Suncity Tibbi Road, Hanumangarh.

21. Yograj S/o Shri Rawat Ram, Resident Of Gandhi Children Academy, Near Mahabir Park, Nohar, District Hanumangarh.
22. Daulat Ram S/o Shri Rawat Ram, Resident Of Gandhi Children Academy, Near Mahabir Park, Nohar, District Hanumangarh.
23. Ramdas Juneja S/o Shri Ramrang Juneja, By Caste Arora, C/o Hollu Dream School, Near Khalsa School, Sector 12, Hanumangarh.
24. Chandra Kumar S/o Shri Laxman Das, By Caste Agarwal, Resident Of Ward No. 14, Suresh Kiryana Store, Hanumangarh Junction.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17733/2021

Sandeep Soni S/o Shri Ratan Lal Soni, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 22, Hanumangarh Town, District Hanumangarh.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Local Bodies Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Director, Local Bodies Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. Municipal Council, Hanumangarh, Through Commissioner.
4. Shri Suresh S/o Shri Parmanand, By Caste Sindhi, Resident Of Ward No. 22, Sindhi Mohalla, Hanumangarh Town, Tehsil And District Hanumangarh.
5. Smt. Dropadi W/o Shri Parmanand, By Caste Sindhi, Resident Of Ward No. 22, Sindhi Mohalla, Hanumangarh Town, Tehsil And District Hanumangarh.
6. Deepak Yadav S/o Shri Phool Singh Yadav, By Caste Yadav, Resident Of Ward No. 21, Regar Mohalla, Hanumangarh Town, Tehsil And District Hanumangarh.
7. Braham Prakash Hisariya S/o Shri Sohan Lal Hisariya, By Caste Agarwal, Resident Of Ward No. 18, Near Shyam News Agency, Hanumangarh Town, Tehsil And District Hanumangarh.

----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16385/2022

Sandeep Soni S/o Shri Ratan Lal Soni, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Ward No. 22, Hanumangarh Town, District Hanumangarh

(Rajasthan).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. Director, Local Bodies (Nagar Nigam And Nagar Palika), Jaipur (Raj.).
3. The District Collector, Hanumangarh (Raj.).
4. Commissioner, Nagar Parishad, Hanumangarh (Raj.).

-----Respondents

D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15826/2024

Sandeep Soni S/o Shri Ratan Lal Soni, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Sindi Mohalla, Ward No. 25, Hanumangarh Town, District Hanumangarh.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Local Self Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Director, Local Bodies, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Hanumangarh.
4. The Commissioner, Nagar Parishad, Hanumangarh Town, District Hanumangarh.
5. Smt. Anju Bansal W/o Shri Dinesh Bansal, R/o Street No. 13, New Abadi, Ward No. 25, Hanumangarh Town, District Hanumangarh.
6. Dinesh Bansal S/o Shri Rajendra Kumar Bansal, R/o Street No. 13, New Abadi, Ward No. 25, Hanumangarh Town, District Hanumangarh.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Leela Dhar Khatri
Mr. Gaurav Ranka
Mr. Dixit Panwar for
Mr. Rakesh Matoria
Mr. Gopi Ram Goyal

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Ayush Gehlot, AAAG
Mr. Rakesh Sharma for
Mr. Rajesh Panwar, AAG
Mr. CS Kotwani
Mr. Ravindra Choudhary for

Mr. N.S. Rathore, AAG
Mr. Rajendra Jhala for
Mr. S.S. Ladrecha
Mr. Avdhesh Parashar
Mr. Moti Singh
Mr. Deepak Pareek
Mr. Baltej Singh
Ms. Simran Mehta for
Ms. Falgun Buch

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

Judgment

13/04/2026

1. The petitioner has filed these nine writ petitions with the following case titles, the following case numbers and following prayers:-

Sr. No.	CASE TITLE	CASE NOS.	PRAYERS:	FILED ON	STATUS
1.	Sandeep Soni v/s State	S.B.C.W. No.1171/2020	(i) The respondent authorities may kindly be directed to provide the basic facilities in the residential colonies, which have been created earlier in Municipal Area, Hanumangarh. (ii) The respondent authorities may kindly be directed to provide the basic facilities in the newly created residential colony Ward No. 1, Behind Shiv Cinema, Hanumangarh before allotment of the plots. (ii) Any other appropriate writ, order or direction	21.01.2020	Pending

			which this Hon'ble Court deems just and proper may kindly be passed in favour of the petitioner.		
2.	Sandeep Soni v/s State	D.B.C.W. No.748/2021	By way of this writ petition, the petitioner is seeking directions to the respondents to take action against the encroachers who have made construction over the plot without taking permission from the Municipal Council, Hanumangarh	11.01.2021	Decided on 27.01.2021
3.	Sandeep Soni v/s State	D.B. REVIEW PETITION NO.20/2021	This review petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking review of order dated 27 th of January, 2021 passed by this Court in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.748/2021, whereby this Court declined to exercise PIL jurisdiction in respect of grievance raised against construction raised without taking permission from the Municipal Council, Hanumangarh.	06.02.2021	Decided on 03.03.2021
4.	Sandeep Soni v/s State	D.B.C.W. NO.3191/2021	a) by an appropriate writ, order or direction to the respondents for conducting a high-level inquiry in the lease deed annexed form Annexure-5 to 25 and after inquiry the lease deed may be declared as void, ab-initio and the possession of the land may be taken back from the alleged beneficiaries; b) in the alternate by an appropriate writ, order or direction the lease deed mentioned in Annexure-5 to 25	16.02.2021	Pending

			may kindly be declared void and quashed and set aside and the Municipality Hanumangarh may be directed to take the possession back to the property mentioned in the lease deed;		
5.	Sandeep Soni v/s State	D.B.C.W NO.1079 0/2021	This writ petition has been filed by the petitioner with a prayer that the respondents be directed to take action against the persons, who have made encroachment in the city of Hanumangarh, with a further direction to the respondents to remove encroachment of the encroachers, who have made constructions on their plots, without getting any permission from the Municipal Council, Hanumangarh.	11.08. 2021	Decided on 26.08.2021
6.	Sandeep Soni v/s State	S.B.C.W. NO.1773 3/2021	a) It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that writ petition of the petitioner may kindly be allowed and:- by an appropriate writ, order or direction to the respondent NO.1 to 3 to stop the construction made by the private respondent No.4 to 7 upon the plot in question as per their sale deeds for residential to commercial use; b) by an appropriate writ of mandamus may also be issued against the respondents that without change of use as per law no	15.12. 2021	Pending

			construction is to be made;		
7.	Sandeep Soni v/s State	D.B.C.W. NO.1638 5/2022	a) It may kindly be directed to the respondent authorities to prevent/stop the illegal construction of shops over the land reserved for purpose of Public Park/Playground according to the Master Plan and demolish the illegal construction already raised; b) It may kindly be directed to the responsible respondent authority to ensure construction, development and maintenance of Public Park over the land reserved for purpose of Public Park/Playground; c) It may kindly be directed to the anti-corruption department to register a case of criminal conspiracy to snatch the land of public by land mafia/traffickers and be punished;	01.11.2022	Pending
8.	Sandeep Soni v/s State	S.B.C.W. NO.1582 6/2024	A) The respondent No.1 to 4 may be directed to demolish illegal construction raised by the respondent No.5 and 6 over their residential plot situated near Goshala Road, Ward No.25, Hanumangarh Town, District Hanumangarh. b) That during the pendency of the writ petition if any further construction has been	11.09.2022	Pending

			raised by the respondents No.5 and 6, the same may kindly be ordered to be removed.		
9.	Sandeep Soni v/s State	DB.C.W. NO.2605/2026	i) Issue an appropriate writ, order or direction to immediately demolish all illegal and unauthorized constructions raised in the residential scheme "Emporia, ii) Direct the Respondent Authorities to restore the approved layout plan, including public roads, parking areas, and open spaces, to their original sanctioned form, after the demolition of illegal constructions. iii) Direct the Respondent Authorities to initiate strict action under the Rajasthan Municipalities Act, 2009, RERA Act, 2016, and other applicable laws against the Respondent-Developer for violations, including non-compliance with notices, illegal construction, and encroachments; iv) Direct the Respondent Authorities to ensure that public roads, parking areas, water supply, drainage, and other public utilities are restored and protected from further encroachments or illegal constructions;	29.01.2026	Pending

2. Out of these, the following matters are listed for consideration today, namely, C.W. No. 2605/2026, C.W. No.

1171/2020, C.W. No. 3191/2021, C.W. No. 17733/2021, C.W. No. 16385/2022, and C.W. No. 15826/2024.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent-State, Mr. Ayush Gehlot, AAAG submits that there are flagrant violation of the Public Interest Litigation laws and also the litigants seem to be a compulsive litigant without adhering to the norms. He referring to the Rule 385F of Rules of the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan, 1952 which is for regular PIL petition and Rules 385G and 385H which reads as under:-

"385-F.- Facts to be disclosed.- A petition filed in public interest shall disclose-

- (1) the social public standing/professional status and public spirited antecedents of the petitioner/petitioners;
- (2) the sources of finance for meeting the expenditure related with the petition alongwith Permanent Account Number, if any, with the Income Tax Department;
- (3) the source of the information on which the averments made in the petition are based;
- (4) the facts constituting the cause;
- (5) the nature of injury caused or likely to be caused to the public;
- (6) the nature and extent of the personal interest, if any, of the petitioner/petitioners involved in the cause; and
- (7) as to whether the petitioner, or any of the petitioners when there are more than one, is or has been involved in any other civil, revenue, criminal litigation in any capacity before any Court or Tribunal and if so, complete details of such litigation including the subject matter thereof.

385-G. Prima facie proof and affidavits. A petition filed in public interest shall, as far as practicable, be supported by prima facie proof, and an affidavit, on each substantive averment/allegation.

385-H. Declaration necessary. (1) A petition filed in public interest shall contain a declaration of the

petitioner/petitioners that a thorough research has been conducted in the matter raised through the public interest litigation; and all the relevant material in respect of such research shall be annexed with the petition.

(2) A petition filed in public interest shall further contain a declaration of the petitioner/petitioners that to the best of his/their knowledge and research, the issue raised was not dealt with or decided and that a similar or identical petition was not filed earlier by any person; and in case, such an issue was dealt with or a similar or identical petition was filed earlier, its status or the result."

4. Learned counsel for the respondent-State, Mr. Ayush Gehlot, AAAG submits that the prayers are analogous though with slight difference. He further submits that a litigant who is not approaching the Court with clean hands, should not to be entertained and heavy cost may be imposed upon him. Learned counsel for the respondent-State further submits that abusing the process of law in Public Interest Litigation itself is a reason sufficient for this Court to not entertain such litigation on merits. He further submits that the petitioner approaching with common prayers and similar kind of leave in one forum or other forum of this Court is nothing but a gross abuse of process of law. He further submits that the Rule also requires the petitioner to disclose his criminal antecedents.

5. The Government counsel brought on record the criminal antecedents of the petitioner – Sandeep Soni, which are as follows:

क्रम संख्या	मुकदमा नम्बर	धारा	चालान	फैसला / पेंडिंग
1	668/2017 पुलिस थाना हनु जेक्शन	323, 384 भा.द.स व 3 एससी/एसटी एक्ट	26.09.2018	दिनांक 31.10.2023 को माननीय उच्च न्यायालय जोधपुर द्वारा संदीप सोनी के खिलाफ कार्यवाही रद्द की गई।
2	222/2020	376, 376 (2)	20.04.202	दिनांक

	पुलिस थाना महिला हनुमानगढ़	(एन), 384, 450 भा.द.स व 66 ई, 67 ए आईटी एक्ट		12.07.2023 साक्ष्य के अभाव में बरी।
3	452/2021 पुलिस थाना हनु जंक्शन	353, 504, 189 भा.द.स	25.01.2023	पेंडिंग अदालत
4	298/2001 पुलिस थाना हनु टाउन	323, 341, 34 भा.द.स	02.08.2001	राजीनामा बरी / 23.03.2002
5	603/2025 पुलिस थाना हनु जंक्शन	115(2), 126(2), 351(2), 352 बी. एन. एस. 3(1) (एससी/एसटी एक्ट)	-	पेंडिंग पुलिस

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner tries to point out that some of the earlier litigation may have been bonafide, and the petitioner also has the right to make out the case that some of the petitions contain different prayers. Learned counsel further attempts to persuade this Court that the subsequent conduct of the petitioner should not affect the earlier rights, which accrued to the petitioner through litigation launched years ago, which was bonafide in nature.

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Leela Dhar Khatri also submits that the rights are individual in nature in item No.18.

8. Learned counsel for the respondent, Mr. Ayush Gehlot submits that the claim of the petitioner to have individual right is also not correct, because in the prayer, he is seeking demolition of illegal constructions and removal of any construction, which was unlawful in nature, which is almost similar to that of the PIL.

9. Learned counsels for the petitioner also tries to impress upon the Court that the subsequent PILs and the abuse of process may not have a retrospective impact upon the litigation which is pending.

10. This Court, upon hearing the submissions of both the parties and after perusal of the record, observes that the present batch of petitions, though filed at different points of time, revolve around substantially similar subject matters pertaining to alleged illegal constructions, encroachments, and inaction of municipal authorities within Hanumangarh.

10.1. This Court further observes that the petitioner, while invoking the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court, was under a statutory obligation to make complete and truthful disclosures in terms of Rules 385-F and 385-H of the Rules of the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan, 1952; however, such mandatory disclosures have not been adhered to.

10.2. This Court notes that in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1171/2020, the petitioner has failed to disclose:

- prior litigation history,
- source of information,
- personal interest despite being an applicant in the subject matter,
- delay in approaching the Court despite decades-old cause of action,

and has also not furnished the declaration as required under Rule 385-H.

10.3. This Court finds that in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17733/2021, the petitioner has made a false declaration stating that no prior writ petition had been filed, whereas S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1171/2020 was already pending. This Court further notes that the said petition pertains to a private property dispute,

which has been projected as a public law issue, without disclosure of alternative remedies or parallel proceedings.

10.4.This Court observes that in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3191/2021, the petitioner has not disclosed the pendency of earlier petitions and has also failed to disclose his personal interest in the lease-related dispute. This Court further notes that the rights of affected third parties and availability of alternative remedies have not been disclosed, thereby concealing material facts.

10.5.This Court notes that in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 16385/2022 (PIL), the petitioner has declared that he has no personal interest in the matter, which is not borne out from the overall conduct and repeated involvement of the petitioner in similar issues. This Court further finds that prior litigations were not disclosed and the declaration under Rule 385-H is incomplete and misleading. The assertion regarding absence of alternative remedy is also found to be incorrect.

10.6.This Court observes that in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15826/2024, the petitioner has again made a false statement that no prior writ petition has been filed, despite multiple earlier petitions on similar issues.

10.7.This Court finds that in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2605/2026 (PIL), the petitioner has once again falsely declared that no such writ petition had been filed previously, despite a series of earlier petitions. This Court further observes that the petitioner has not disclosed his criminal antecedents, prior adverse orders, or the

repetitive nature of the cause of action, thereby making a materially false and misleading disclosure.

10.8. This Court further observes that in none of the petitions has the petitioner disclosed his criminal antecedents, which is a relevant factor while examining the bona fides of a litigant invoking public interest jurisdiction.

10.9. This Court finds that the petitioner has consistently:

- suppressed prior litigation,
- failed to disclose material facts,
- made false statements on oath,
- concealed personal interest,
- and misrepresented private disputes as public interest matters.

11. Thus, this Court is of the firm opinion that any litigant, who at any juncture as mentioned hereinbefore, tries to abuse the process of law, cannot be permitted to continue his litigation. The flagrant violation is on record, as the petitioner has not disclosed his criminal antecedents and has also not disclosed the details envisaged under Rule 385-F and 385-H of the Rules of the High Court of Judicature for Rajasthan, 1952 which require him to file the PILs within the well disclosed parameters. The overall conduct of the petitioner, in filing these petitions, has a cumulative impact, and the broader parameters of the challenges therein are of a similar nature. Furthermore, once the litigant is tainted with the fact of not making the statutory disclosures and of filing wrongful affidavits, this Court ought to take a stringent view and deny such a litigant the right to continue litigation.

12. Therefore, without touching the issue on merit and leaving it open, as it may impact public at large, this Court limiting its exercise today to the right of the present litigant to approach this Court, while abusing the process of law, which at the threshold, debars the petitioner carrying on this kind of litigation, all the writ petitions, are **dismissed** only on the ground that the petitioner with his misconduct and abuse of process of law is not entitled to continue such litigation and furthermore, the petitioner shall be required to pay cost of Rs.5,000/- for each litigation which shall be deposited with Rajasthan State Legal Services Authority, Jodhpur.

13. In case the petitioner, files any litigation in future, he shall be required to disclose this order to the concerned Court in his pleadings in a prominent manner.

(SANDEEP SHAH),J

(DR.PUSHPENDRA SINGH BHATI),J

13-raoof khan/-