

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR**

(1) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7718/2025

Sheela Kumari W/o Shri Ram Narayan Sharma, Aged About 47 Years, R/o 119, Ward No. 10, Bohra, Jolpa, Tehsil Khanpur, District Jhalawar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur Rajasthan.
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Local Self Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
3. Director And Special Secretary Administration, Local Self Department, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. Deputy Commissioner And Deputy Secretary Administration (I), Rural Development And Panchayat Raj. Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Jhalawar, Raj.
6. District Collector, Jhalawar, Rajasthan.
7. Smt. Santosh, Up Pradhan, Panchayat Samiti Khanpur, Jhalawar, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

Connected With

(2) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2338/2020

1. Jagdish Shekhawat Son Of Shri Mangej Singh, Aged About 75 Years, Resident Of Village Beri, Tehsil Surajgarh, Distt. Jhunjhunu.
2. Manroop Singh Son Of Shri Shadi Ram, Aged About 67 Years, Resident Of Bangothadi Khurd, Tehsil Surajgarh, Distt. Jhunjhunu.
3. Man Singh Son Of Shri Balu Singh, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Bangothadi Kalan, Tehsil Surajgarh, Distt. Jhunjhunu.
4. Sukhveer Singh Son Of Shri Mohar Singh, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Bangodhadi Kalan, Tehsil Surajgarh, Distt. Jhunjhunu.
5. Samundra Singh Son Of Shri Bhagwat Singh, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village Chhapara, Tehsil Surajgarh,

Distt. Jhunjhunu.

6. Mahipal Singh Son Of Shri Annaya Singh, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Chhapara, Tehsil Surajgarh, Distt. Jhunjhunu.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Additional Chief Secretary To The Government, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Jhunjhunu.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Jhunjhunu.

-----Respondents

(3) D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 627/2025

1. Bhagirath Prasad Jat, Son Of Shri Kana Ram Jat, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Gulabbadi, Tehsil Shahpura, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Hari Narayan Dadarwal, Son Of Shri Shyam Lal Jat, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Gulabbadi, Tehsil Shahpura, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Ramesh Gathala Son Of Shri Balu Ram Gathala, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Gulabbadi, Tehsil Shahpura, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary And Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Collector Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. Sub-Division Officer, Shahpura, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(4) D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 628/2025

1. Dr. Kajod Mal Bhawaria, Son Of Shri Hanuman Sahay, Aged About 75 Years, Resident Of Village Gomawali, Post Sihodi, Via Thoi, Tehsil Srimadhampur District Sikar, Rajasthan.
2. Sita Ram Jat, Son Of Shri Murlidhar Bhawaria, Aged About 62 Years, Village Gomawali, Post Sihodi, Via Thoi, Tehsil Srimadhampur District Sikar, Rajasthan.
3. Mohan Lal Bhawaria, Son Of Shri Hanuman Prasad, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Village Gomawali, Post Sihodi, Via Thoi, Tehsil Srimadhampur District Sikar, Rajasthan.
4. Mohan Debana, Son Of Shri Babu Lal Debana, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Gomawali, Post Sihodi, Via Thoi, Tehsil Srimadhampur District Sikar, Rajasthan.
5. Ratan Lal, Son Of Shri Laxman, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Village Gomawali, Post Sihodi, Via Thoi, Tehsil Srimadhampur District Sikar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary And Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Collector, Sikar, Rajasthan.
4. Sub-Division Officer, Srimadhampur, District Sikar, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(5) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3695/2025

Bhagwan Singh S/o Shri Faguniram, Aged About 73 Years, R/o Village And Post Bachhamadi (Noah) Tehsil And District Bharatpur (Raj)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Local Self

Government, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(6) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6505/2025

1. Banshi Ram S/o Kalu Ram, Aged About 68 Years, R/o Todiya Ka Baas, Bansur, Lekri, Alwar (Raj.)- 301402.
2. Ram Kishan Gurjar C/o Sunda, Aged About 64 Years, R/o House No. 75, Todiya Ka Baas, Bansur, Lekri, Alwar (Raj.)- 301402.
3. Mohar Singh Gurjar S/o Sardara Ram, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Todiya Ka Baas, Bansur, Lekri, Alwar (Raj.)- 301402.
4. Banwari Lal Gurjar S/o Sultan Gurjar, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Todiya Ka Baas, Bansur, Lekri, Alwar (Raj.)- 301402.
5. Ramavtar Gurjar S/o Gyarsi Ram, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Todiya Ka Baas, Bansur, Lekri, Alwar (Raj.)- 301402.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Local Self Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Director And Special Secretary, Local Self Department, G-3 Rajmahal Residential Area, C-Scheme, Near Civil Lines Crossing, Jaipur (Raj.)
3. The Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.)
4. District Collector, Kotputli-Behror (Raj.)
5. Sub Divisional Officer, Bansur, District Kotputli-Behror (Raj.)
6. Nagar Palika Bansur, Through Its Executive Officer.

-----Respondents

(7) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7029/2025

1. Harimohan Meena S/o Shri Indar, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Mahal Dhankri, Karanpur, Karauli (Raj.).
2. Priyanka Bai C/o Ramdeen Meena, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Mahal Dhankri, Karauli (Raj.).
3. Ramsahay Meena S/o Shri Harimohan Meena, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Mahal Dhankri, Karanpur, Karauli (Raj.).

4. Nandkishor Meena S/o Shri Ramswarup Meena, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Bhopa Ki Bakhir, Mahal Dhankri, Karanpur, Karauli (Raj.).
5. Ghamandi S/o Shri Douji Meena, Aged About 66 Years, R/o Mahal Dhankri, Karanpur, Karauli (Raj.).
6. Harachi S/o Shri Jailal, Aged About 72 Years, R/o Mandir Ke Pass, Mahal Dhankri, Karanpur, Karauli (Raj.).
7. Ramraj Meena S/o Shri Rochhpal Meena, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Mandir Ke Pas, Mahal Dhankri, Karanpur, Karauli (Raj.).
8. Karoo Meena S/o Shri Halka Meena, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Mahal Dhankri, Karanpur, Sapotra, Karauli (Raj.).
9. Lhssu S/o Shri Prabhu, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Karanpur, Sapotra, Karauli (Raj.).
10. Pishta W/o Lahssu Meena, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Mahal Dhankri, Karanpur, Karauli (Raj.).
11. Sanjay Meena S/o Shri Ganesh Meena, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Mahal Dhankri, Karanpur, Karauli (Raj.).
12. Bantee Meena S/o Shri Rambhajan Meena, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Mahal Dhankri, Karauli (Raj.).

-----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 District Collector And District Magistrate, Karauli (Raj.).
4. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Karauli (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(8) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7517/2025

1. Amresh Kumar Meena S/o Shri Nathuaa Lal Meena, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Tamolipura, Salempur, Sapotra, Karauli (Raj.).
2. Kishori Lal S/o Shri Mannu Lal, Aged About 71 Years, R/o Village Tamolipura, Salempur, Sapotra, Karauli (Raj.).

3. Laxmi Chand Meena S/o Shri Ramswroop Meena, Aged About 59 Years, R/o Village Tamolipura, Salempur, Sapotra, Karauli (Raj.).
4. Indresh Prajapat S/o Shri Mohar Singh Prajapat, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Village Tamolipura, Salempur, Sapotra, Karauli (Raj.).
5. Teekaram Prajapat S/o Shri Ramprasad Prajapat, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Tamolipura, Salempur, Sapotra, Karauli (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.)
3. The District Collector, Karauli, District Karauli Rajasthan
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sapotra, District Karauli Rajasthan.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Karauli.
6. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Sapotra, District Karauli.

-----Respondents

(9) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7882/2025

Laxman Gurjar S/o Shri Bahgwan Sahai, Aged About 66 Years, R/o Village Khan Bhankri, Tehsil And District Dausa, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Director And Special Secretary, Local Self

Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan,
Secretariat, Jaipur.

4. District Collector, Dausa (Rajasthan)
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer And Sub -Division Magistrate,
Dausa, District Dausa.
6. The Executive Officer, Nagar Parishad Duasa, District
Dausa (Rajasthan)

-----Respondents

(10) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8059/2025

1. Mali Ram Jat S/o Shri Nathu Ram Jat, R/o Ward No.15,
Dhani Derawali Gram Panchayat Nangalbhim, Tehsil
Srimadhampur District Sikar.
2. Babulal S/o Narain, R/o Ward No.9, Dhani Narawali Gram
Panchayat Nangalbhim, Tehsil Srimadhampur District Sikar.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary,
Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department
Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Sikar.

-----Respondents

(11) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8192/2025

1. Villagers Of Revenue Village Singhaniya, Gram Panchayat
Kanchanpur, Panchayat Samiti, Masalpur, District Karauli
Through Villager Prakash Chand, S/o Shri Fodi Ram, Aged
About 67 Years, R/o Village Singhaniya, Post Kanchanpur,
Tehsil, Masalpur, District Karauli.
2. Villagers Of Revenue Village Farakpur, Gram Panchayat
Kanchanpur, Panchayat Samiti, Masalpur, District Karauli
Through Villager Prem Singh Gurjar, S/o Shri Mansukh
Gurjar, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Farakpur, Post
Kanchanpur, Tehsil, Masalpur, District Karauli.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Rural
Development And Panchayati Raj Department,
Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Karauli

3. Sub Divisional Officer, Karauli, District Karauli

-----Respondents

(12) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9220/2025

Ramprasad Jangid S/o Ganpat Ram Jangid, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Rosawa, Fatehpur Shekhawati, District Sikar (Raj.) 332301

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Governance And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Dy. Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
3. District Collector, Sikar (Raj.)
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Fatehpur Shekhawati, District Sikar (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(13) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9422/2025

1. Bhanwar Lal Jat Son Of Gordhan Ram Jat, Resident Of Ward No.09, Chak Mitai, Sikar, Rajasthan-332742.
2. Madhu Ram Muwal Son Of Dhanna Ram Muwal, Resident Of Ward No.09, Chak Mitai, Sikar Rajasthan-332742.
3. Bhanwar Lal Son Of Likhama Ram, Resident Of Sundo Ki Dhani, Chak Mitai, Mandha Surera, Sikar, Rajasthan, 332742.
4. Nopa Son Of Binja Ram, Resident Of Ward No. 10 Chak Mitai, Sikar, Rajasthan-332742
5. Ramkumar Son Of Maliram, Resident Of Ward No.10, Chak Mitai, Sikar, Mandha Surera Rajasthan-332742.
6. Ratan Yadav Son Of Mohan Lal, Resident Of Aheer Ka Bas, Sikar, Danta Ramgarh, Rajasthan-332703.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat Jaipur.
2. Authorised Officer (District Collector), Sikar Panchayat

Reorganisation/new Creation-2025.

3. Tehsildar, Dantaramgarh, District-Sikar (Rajasthan).

----Respondents

(14) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9430/2025

Om Prakash, Son Of Ram Khiladi, Aged About 69 Years, Resident Of Village Hathipura, Raghuwanshi Gram Panchayat, District Karauli, Rajasthan

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Rural Development Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Karauli, Rajasthan.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Karauli, Rajasthan.

----Respondents


(15) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9437/2025

Smt. Bhanwar Kanwar W/o Shri Mahaveer Singh Rajawat, Aged About 66 Years, R/o- Watika Garh, Village- Watika, Tehsil-Sanganer, District- Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan
2. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan
3. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. The Director And Special Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
5. The Deputy Commissioner Cum Deputy Secretary(First), Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan



6. The District Collector, District- Jaipur
7. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti -Sanganer, District- Jaipur.
8. Smt. Suchitra Devi, Up-Pradhan, Panchayat Samiti Sanganer, District Jaipur (Presently Having Charge Of Pradhan Of Panchayat Samiti- Sanganer, District Jaipur)

-----Respondents

(16) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9485/2025

1. Dharam Singh S/o Ramji Lal, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Virhata Tehsil Masalpur, District Karauli.
2. Pooran S/o Sumera, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Virhata Tehsil Masalpur, District Karauli.
3. Vijendra S/o Mohar Singh, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Virhata Tehsil Masalpur, District Karauli.
4. Deshraj S/o Bharat Singh, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Virhata Tehsil Masalpur, District Karauli.
5. Jandel Singh S/o Kalyan Singh, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Virhata Tehsil Masalpur, District Karauli.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Governance And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Deputy Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan Secretariat, Jaipur
3. District Collector, Karauli
4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Tehsil Masalpur, District Karauli

-----Respondents

(17) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9815/2025

Paras Chand Jain S/o Shri Kalyanmal Jain, R/o 110, Jain Mohalla, Sans Kacholia, Tehsil Malpura District Tonk

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Director Cum Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur

2. District Collector, Tonk Rajasthan
3. Sub Divisional Magistrate, Malpura, District Tonk

----Respondents

(18) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9856/2025

Banshidhar Khandela S/o Late Shri Gopal Singh Khandela, Aged About 71 Years, R/o Dhani Rupa Wali, Post Tapipalya, Tehsil Reengus, District Sikar (Rajasthan), Presently Residing At Songiri Bavdi, Behind Police Station, Khandela, Tehsil Khandela, District Sikar (Rajasthan). Earlier Elected As A Mla From Legislative Assembly Khandela And Also Held The Post Of Minister For State Of Medical And Health Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Authorized Officer (District Collector), Sikar, Panchayat Re-Constitution/recreation-2025, Room No. 31, Collectorate Premises, Sikar.
5. The Sub-Division Officer, Khandela, District Sikar.

----Respondents

(19) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10226/2025

Ramswaroop S/o Tulsiram, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Ward No. 03, Kuthaniya, Moi Purani, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan, Ex-Sarpanch Of Gram Panchayat Moi Bharu.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development

And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Rajasthan,
Jaipur.

4. The District Collector, Jhunjhunu.

----Respondents

(20) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10236/2025

Kalulal S/o Devlal, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Nayamatkhedi,
Tehsil Ramganjmandi, District Kota, Raj.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural, Government And Panchayati Raj. Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Dy. Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
3. District Collector, Kota (Raj.)
4. Sub- Divisional Officer Panchayat (Sdm), Ramganjmandi, District Kota (Raj.)

----Respondents

(21) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10507/2025

1. Shivji Ram Meena S/o Shri Lakhma Ram Meena, Aged About 64 Years, R/o Village Manpura, Beejwar, Tonk Rajasthan.
2. Kartar Singh Meena S/o Shri Changa Ram Meena, Aged About 49 Years, R/o Meena Mohalla, Village Manpura, Beejwad, Tonk.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Director Cum Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Tonk Rajasthan.
3. Sub Divisional Magistrate, Deoli, District Tonk.

----Respondents

(22) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.12081/2025

Maluram Meena S/o Shri Jhootha Ram Meena, Age 62 Years, R/o Bada Ka Khera, Ajmer Road, Baba Market, Bagru, District Jaipur,



Rajasthan

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Urban Development And Housing Department, Secretariat, Jaipur-302005
2. District Collector, Jaipur
3. Delimitation Officer (Local Bodies), Jaipur
4. Director, Directorate Of Local Bodies, Jaipur, Rajasthan

----Respondents

(23) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 14902/2019

Inhabitants Of Village Samia, Gram Panchayat Jethana, Panchayat Samiti Pisangan, Tehsil Pisangan, District Ajmer Through Panna Lal Gena (Choudhary) Son Of Shri Ramchandra Choudhary, Age About 50 Years, Resident Of Post Samla Gram Panchayat Jethana, Panchayat Samiti Pisangan, Tehsil Pisangan, District Ajmer And Presently Serving As A Sarpanch At Gram Panchayat Jethana Tehsil Pisangan, District Ajmer.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary To The Government Department Of Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. State Government Of Rajasthan Through Its Commissioner And Secretary, Gramin Vikas And Panchayati Raj (Panchayati Raj Department), Secretariat Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Ajmer.
4. Zila Parishad, Ajmer, Through The Chief Executive Officer Having Office At Drda Building Collectorate, Ajmer.

----Respondents

(24) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 15190/2019

Inhabitants Of Village Shivpura, Gram Panchayat Karnos, Panchayat Samiti Pisangan, Tehsil Pisangan, District Ajmer Through Ugam Singh Son Of Shri Dulha Singh, Age About 65 Years, Resident Of Post Shivpura Gram Panchayat Karnos, Panchayat Samiti Pisangan, Tehsil Pisangan, District Ajmer And Presently Serving As A Up- Sarpanch At Gram Panchayat Karnos Tehsil Pisangan, District Ajmer.

----Petitioner

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary To The Government, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. State Government Of Rajasthan Through Its Commissioner And Secretary, Gramin Vikas And Panchayati Raj (Panchayati Raj Department), Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Ajmer.
4. Zila Parishad, Ajmer Through The Chief Executive Officer, Having Office At Drda Building, Collectorate, Ajmer.

----Respondents

(25) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 17635/2019

Aam Janta Vijaypura, Panchayat Samiti Lalsot, District Dausa Through Its Representative Meetha Lal Meena S/o Heera Lal Meena, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Vijaypura Panchayat Samiti Lalsot District Dausa.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Secretariat, Govt. Of Rajasthan Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Dausa.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Lalsot District Dausa.

----Respondents

(26) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 18156/2019

All Villagers Village Ranapada, Panchayat Samiti Bandikui, District Dausa Through Bholu Ram Saini S/o Shri Har Sahai Saini, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of Village Ranapada, Post Punderpada, Tehsil Baswa, Panchayat Samiti Bandikui, District Dausa (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)

2. District Collector, Dausa (Raj.)
3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Bandikui, District Dausa (Raj.)
4. Block Development Officer, Bandikui, District Dausa (Raj.)
5. All Villagers of Village- Meenapada, Panchayat Samiti Bandikui, District- Dausa Through Rajesh Kumar Meena Son Of Shri Umrao Singh Meena, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Meenapada, Post- Punderpada, Tehsil- Baswa, District-Dausa (Raj.)
6. Sukya Meena Son Of Shri Amar Chand Meena, Aged About 70 Years, R/o Village Meenapada, Post-Punderpada, Tehsil-Baswa, District Dausa (Raj.).
7. Kailash Meena Son Of Shri Gulab Chand Meena, Aged About 51 Years, R/o Village Meenapada, Post - Punderpada, Tehsil-Baswa, District-Dausa (Raj.)
8. Mohar Singh Meena Son Of Shri Jaldhari Meena, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Meenapada, Post - Punderpada, Tehsil-Baswa, District-Dausa (Raj.)
9. Ramswaroop Meena Son Of Shri Kanchan Meena, Aged About 58 Years, R/o Village Meenapada, Post - Punderpada, Tehsil-Baswa, District-Dausa (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(27) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20239/2019

1. Dharmendra Kuamr S/o Shri Nathi Singh, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Madariapura, Gram Panchayat Bhensa, Tehsil Roopwas, District Bharatpur (Raj).
2. Prem Singh S/o Shri Payare Lal, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Raheempur, Tehsil Roopwas, District Bharatpur (Raj.).
3. Badan Singh S/o Shri Atar Singh, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Village Sehna, Gram Panchayat Sehna, Tehsil Roopwas, District Bharatpur (Raj.)
4. Lal Singh S/o Shri Raghuveer Singh, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Jaicholi Gram Panchayat Fatehpur, Tehsil Roopwas, District Bharatpur (Raj.)
5. Fateh Singh S/o Shri Ramesh Chand, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of Gram Panchayat Fatehpur, Teshil Roopwas, District Bharatpur (Raj.)

-----Petitioners

Versus



1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat Shasan Sachivalaya, Vikas Khand, Bhagwan Das Road, Jaipur.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Bharatpur (Raj.)
4. The District Collector, Bharatpur (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(28) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 21022/2019

Dinesh Bhatra S/o Shri Badan Singh, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Village Sahna, Panchayat Samiti Ucchain, District Bharatpur (Raj).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat Shasan Sachivalaya, Vikas Khand, Bhagwan Das Road, Jaipur.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Bharatpur (Raj.)
4. The District Collector, Bharatpur (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(29) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 21820/2019

1. Aam Janta Malarna Chaur, Sawai Madhopur Through By Nathu Lal Mahavar (Sarpanch, Malarna Chaur) S/o Badri Lal Mahavar R/o Parmela Mohalla, Malarna Chaur, District- Sawai Madhopur.
2. Prem Chand Meena (Member Of Ward No. 11) S/o Jansi Meena, R/o Meena Mohalla, Hathai Ke Pass, Malarna Chaur, District- Sawai Madhopur.
3. Suraj Mal Purviya S/o Dhanna Lal Purviya, R/o Moti Katla Purviya Mohalla, Malarna Chaur, District- Sawai Madhopur.
4. Kanji Meena S/o Banshi Lal Meena, R/o Main Road 9, Pani Ki Tanki Ke Pass, Malarna Chaur, District- Sawai

Madhopur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Special Secretary And Director, Government Of Rajasthan, Gramin Vikas And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur (Rajasthan)
2. The District Collector-Cum- Magistrate, Office Of District Collector, Sawai Madhopur.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Sawai Madhopur.

-----Respondents

(30) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4369/2020

1. Karmveer Yadav S/o Sh. Dharamveer Yadav, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Village Rasoolpur Ahiran, Tehsil Buhana, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.
2. Anoop Singh S/o Sh. Subbe Singh, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Rasoolpur Ahiran, Tehsil Buhana, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.
3. Sunit Kumar S/o Sh. Jaswant Singh, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Rasoolpur Ahiran, Tehsil Buhana, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.
4. Mahipal S/o Sh. Jyati Ram, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Village Rasoolpur Ahiran, Tehsil Buhana, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.
5. Dharamveer S/o Sh. Budhram, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Village Rasoolpur Ahiran, Tehsil Buhana, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.
6. Om Prakash S/o Sh. Ram Kumar, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Village Rasoolpur Ahiran, Tehsil Buhana, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Jhunjhunu

4. Sub Divisional Officer, Buhana, District Jhunjhunu

-----Respondents

(31) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10890/2020

Prashant Singh S/o Shri Mohan Singh, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Hindaun Road, Near Railway Phatak, Kherli Rail, Tehsil Kathumar, District - Alwar

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Chief Election Officer Rajasthan, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur
3. Chief Principal Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Department Of Local Bodies, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
4. Chief Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj And Rural Development Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
5. Director Local Bodies, Swayat Shashan Bhawan, Civil Lines, Jaipur

-----Respondents

(32) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10979/2020

Bhajan Lal Khichi S/o Shri Magatu Ram Khichi, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Village Sokhar, Panchayat Samiti, Kathumar, Distt. Alwar (Raj)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Chief Secretary,. Govt. Of Rajasthan, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Chief Election Officer Rajasthan, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur
3. Chief Principal Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Department Of Local Bodies, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur
4. Chief Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj And Rural Development Department, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur
5. Director, Local Bodies, Swayat Shashan Bhawan, Civil Lines, Jaipur

-----Respondents

(33) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11720/2020

1. Akhlak Ahmed S/o Shri Abdul Bari, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Near River Gate Of Jama Maszid, Old Ward No. 32, New Ward No. 41, Karauli
2. Sirajuddin S/o Shri Kamruddin, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Near Makka Maszid, Old Ward No.33, New Ward No. 42, Karauli
3. Firoz Khan S/o Shri Abdul Jabbar, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Near Madina Maszid, Old Ward No. 33, New Ward No. 42, Karauli

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Local Self Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The District Collector, Karauli
3. The Municipal Council, Karauli Through Its Commissioner

-----Respondents

(34) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1267/2023

Smt. Rasnam Bai Wife Of Shri Gopal Singh Jat, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Baroda Mev, Tehsil Laxmangarh, District Alwar.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Deputy Commisioner And Deputy Secretary-I, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. District Collector (Panchayat), Alwar.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Alwar.
6. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Govindgarh, District Alwar.

-----Respondents

(35) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2501/2023

Smt. Rasnam Bai Wife Of Shri Gopal Singh Jat, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Village And Post Baroda Mev, Tehsil Laxmangarh, District Alwar.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Deputy Commissioner And Deputy Secretary-I, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. District Collector (Panchayat), Alwar.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Alwar.
6. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Govindgarh, District Alwar.
7. Shri Liyakat Khan, Ward Member Of Ward No. 8 Of The Panchayat Samiti, Panchayat Samiti Govindgarh, District Alwar.

-----Respondents

(36) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3539/2023

Krishna Kant Jain S/o Shri Ramji Lal, Aged About 38 Years, R/o House No. 364, Bheru Baba Ka Chhokad, Village Govindgarh, Tehsil Laxmangarh, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary To Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
3. The Dy. Commissioner And Dy. Secretary-I, Department

Of Panchayati Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
(Raj.)

4. The District Collector (Panchayat), Alwar.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad Alwar (Raj.)
6. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Govindgarh, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)
7. Shri Mohan Lal Panchayat Samiti Member, Govindgarh (Ward No. 19, Panchayat Samiti Govindgarh, Distt. Alwar (Raj.)

----Respondents

(37) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9804/2023

Smt. Rasnam Bai Wife Of Shri Gopal Singh Jat, Resident Of Village And Post Baroda Mev, Tehsil Laxmangarh, District Alwar (Rajasthan).

----Petitioner

Versus


1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayti Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Jaipur, Rajasthan
4. Deputy Commissioner And Deputy Secretary-I, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan
5. District Collector, Alwar
6. Additional Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Alwar
7. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Govindgarh, District Alwar
8. Liyakat Khan, Ward Member Of Ward No. 8, Panchayat Samiti Govindgarh, District Alwar.

----Respondents

(38) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 326/2025

Smt. Bhouri Devi Meena W/o Shri Gopal Lal Meena, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Rampurawas Ramgarh, Tehsil Jamwaram

Garh, District, Jaipur, 303012



-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary Department Of Local Self-Government Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Director Cum Special Secretary, Department Of Local Self-Government, Government Of Rajasthan, G-3, Rajmahal Residencial Area, C-Scheme Near Civil Lines Phatak, Jaipur-16, Rajasthan
3. District Collector, District Jaipur, Ollectorate Campus, 230, Madho Singh Rd, Bani Park, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302006.

-----Respondents

(39) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1285/2025

1. Giriraj Singh Devanda S/o Shri Sahaja Ram, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Village Nangal Kalan, Sub Tehsil Govindgarh, Tehsil Chomu, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Nand Kishore Yadav S/o Shri Prabhati Lal Yadav, Aged About 70 Years, Aged About 70 Years R/o Mangrawali Dhani, Village Dhodhsar, Govindgarh, Tehsil Chomu, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Laxmi Chand Choudhary S/o Shri Moti Ram Choudahry, Aged About 53 Years, R/o Village Bhutera, Tehsil Chomu, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. Suresh Kumar Bajiya S/o Shri Surajmal Bajiya, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Dhani -Dediwali, Singod Kalan, Via-Khejroli, Tehsil Chomu, District Jaipur Rajasthan
5. Jagdish Prasad Yadav S/o Shri Surajmal A/s Mangla Ram Yadav, Aged About 48 Years, R/o 172-Ka, Haninwal Tejaji Ke Pass, Village Govindgarh, Tehsil Chomu, District Jaipur, Rajasthan,
6. Ramdev Choudhary S/o Shri Gidaram, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Badhawali, Village Dhodhsar, Tehsil Chomu, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
7. Ram Kumar S/o Shri Ganga Ram, Aged About 35 Years, R/o 96 Mukhya Abadi, Nangal Kalan, Tehsil Chomu, District Jaipur. Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayat Raj Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Chief Election Commissioner, State Of Rajasthan, II Floor Lokayukt Bhawan, Vaniki Marg, C Scheme, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The District Collector, Jaipur, Collectorate Circle, Banipark, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. The Sub Divisional Magistrate Cum Returning Officer, Tehsil Chomu, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

(40) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2360/2025

1. Gram Panchayat Mediya, Panchayat Samiti- Javaja, Beawar Through Sarpanch Deepu Gahlot D/o Shri Champa Lal Gahlot, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Village- Shobhapura, Gram Panchayat- Mediya, Panchayat Samiti- Javaja, Beawar (Rajasthan).
2. Gram Panchayat Noondri Medratan, Beawar Through Sarpanch Kamla Devi W/o Shri Kan Singh Chouhan, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Bhawan Shitla Mata Mandir Ke Pass, Noondri Medratan, Beawar (Rajasthan).
3. Gram Panchayat Jaliya-I, Beawar Through Sarpanch Aamna Bano W/o Shri Alam Kathal, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Roshan Nagar, Jaliya-I, Beawar (Rajasthan).
4. Gram Panchayat Fatehgarh Salla, Beawar Through Sarpanch Aamna Kathal W/o Shri Shahabudeen Kathal, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Dairy, Fatehgarh Salla, Roopnagar, Beawar (Rajasthan).

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Director Cum Principal Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director Cum Joint Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, G-3, Rajmahal Residencial Area, C-Scheme, Near Civil Line Phatak, Jaipur-16, Rajasthan.
3. Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government

Secretariat, Jaipur.

4. Municipal Council Beawar, Through Its Commissioner.
5. District Collector Beawar, District Beawar.

-----Respondents

(41) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2969/2025

Gram Panchayat Losal Chhoti, Panchayat Samiti Dhond, District Sikar Through Its Sarpanch Laxman Singh S/o Shri Ray Singh, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Village Ganeshpura, Post Losal Chhoti, Gram Panchayat Losal Chotti, District Sikar.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Commissioner And Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. Secretary, Panchayat Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. District Collector, Sikar.
5. Additional District Collector, Sikar.
6. Sub Divisional Officer, Dhond, District Sikar.
7. Municipal Board, Losal District Sikar.
8. Panchayat Samiti, Dhond District Sikar Through Its Block Development Officer.

-----Respondents

(42) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3697/2025

Ravina W/o Shri Dilip Singh, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village Jatoli Dhanna, Post Baraso, Gram Panchayat Barso, Tehsil And District Bharatpur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Local Self Government, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(43) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 3698/2025

Ravipal Singh S/o Mansingh, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village And Post Murwara, Gram Panchayat Murwara, Tehsil And District Bharatpur.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Local Self Government, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(44) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4686/2025

Sanyam Lodha S/o Late Shri Prakash Raj Lodha, Aged About 59 Years, Resident Of Nagar Setho Ki Haveli, Sheoganj, Sirohi, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Director And Special Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. State Election Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Department Block Secretariat, Jaipur.
5. The State Election Commissioner, Rajasthan, Development Block, Secretariat, Jaipur.
6. The Election Commission Of India, Through Chief Election Commissioner, Nirvachan Sadan, Ashoka Road, New Delhi 110001.

-----Respondents

(45) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4834/2025

1. Maya W/o Banbari Lal, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Goharpura, Post Sanwa, Tehsil And District Tonk Rajasthan.
2. Dalbar D/o Kesar Lal, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Yusufpura @ Charai, Post Soran, Tehsil And District Tonk Rajasthan.
3. Sunita Devi W/o Sunil Kumar Bairwa, Aged About 39

Years, R/o Bamor, Tehsil And District Tonk

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Director Cum Principal Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director Cum Joint Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, G-3, Rajmahal Residencial Area, C-Scheme, Near Civil Line Phatak, Jaipur-16, Rajasthan.
3. Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. Municipal Council Tonk, Through Its Commissioner.
5. District Collector Tonk, District Tonk.

-----Respondents

(46) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4891/2025

Rajbahadur Singh Raiger S/o Late Shri Bhanwarlal Raiger, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Village Deoli Gaon, Tehsil Deoli, District Tonk Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Director Cum Principal Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director Cum Joint Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, G-3, Rajmahal Residencial Area, C-Scheme, Near Civil Line Phatak, Jaipur -16, Rajasthan.
3. Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. Municipal Board Deoli, District Tonk, Through Its Executive Officer
5. District Collector, Tonk, District Tonk.

-----Respondents

(47) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 4938/2025

Heeralal Gurjar S/o Shri Kesarlal Gurjar, Aged About 27 Years,

R/o Village Nathdi, Tehsil Peeplu, District Tonk Rajasthan

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Director Cum Principal Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director Cum Joint Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, G-3, Rajmahal Residencial Area, C-Scheme, Near Civil Line Phatak, Jaipur-16, Rajasthan.
3. Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. Municipal Board, Peeplu District Tonk, Through Its Executive Officer
5. District Collector, Tonk, District Tonk.

-----Respondents

(48) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5266/2025

Basant Singh W/o Shri Tejpai Singh, Aged About 29 Years, Dai Pedi, Liwari, Gram Panchayat-Bhakeda, District-Alwar.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
4. The Director And Special Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
5. State Election Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Development Block, Secretariat, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(49) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5269/2025

Sahina W/o Shri Mubin Khan, Aged About 34 Years, Bailaka, Gram Panchayat-Bailaka, District-Alwar.



-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. The Director And Special Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
5. State Election Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Development Block, Secretariat, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(50) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5271/2025

Meena Devi W/o Shri Laksman Singh, Aged About 34 Years, Diwakari, Gram Panchayat- Diwakari, District-Alwar.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. The Director And Special Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
5. State Election Commission, Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Development Block, Secretariat, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(51) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5290/2025

Gram Panchayat-Sikhrani, Panchayat Samiti- Masuda, District-Beawar Through Sarpanch/ Administrator- Surrendra Singh Rathore Son Of Shri Shaitan Singh Rathore, Aged 42 Years.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayatiraj, Secretariat, Jaipur- 302005.
2. The Director And Special Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, G-3, Rajmahal Residency Area, Civil Lines Fatak, C-Scheme, Jaipur- 302005.
3. The District Collector, Beawar- 305901.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer- Masuda, District Beawar- 305623.
5. The Nagar Palika- Bijaynagar, District Beawar Through Its Executive Officer/ Commissioner- 305624.

-----Respondents

(52) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5299/2025

Gram Panchayat Kashipura, Panchayat Samiti Peeplu, District Tonk Through Its Sarpanch Poornima Meena W/o Maan Singh Meena Aged About 30 Years R/o Village Kashipura, Tehsil Peeplu, District Tonk (Raj).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj).
2. Commissioner And Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Jaipur (Raj).
3. Secretary, Panchayat Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj).
4. District Collector, District Tonk (Raj).
5. Sub Divisional Officer, Peeplu, District Tonk (Raj).
6. Municipal Board, Peeplu, District Tonk (Raj).
7. Panchayat Samiti Peeplu, District Tonk.

-----Respondents

(53) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5300/2025

Gram Panchayat-Baral-II, Panchayat Samiti- Masuda, District-Beawar Through Sarpanch/administrator-Jyoti Jain Daughter Of Shri Mahaveer Prasad Jain, Aged 26 Years.

-----Petitioner

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayatiraj Secretariat, Jaipur-302005.
2. The Director And Special Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, G-3, Rajmahal Residency Area, Civil Lines Fatak, C-Scheme, Jaipur-302005.
3. The District Collector, Beawar-305901.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer-Masuda, District Beawar-305623.
5. The Nagar Palika- Bijaynagar, District Beawar Through Its Executive Officer/commissioner-305624.

-----Respondents

(54) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5301/2025

Gram Panchayat - Bari, Panchayat Samiti - Masuda, District - Beawar Through Sarpanch / Administrator - Kamla Devi Wife Of Shri Rameshwar Mali, Aged 45 Years.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayatiraj, Secretariat, Jaipur - 302005
2. The Director And Special Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, G-3, Rajmahal Residency Area, Civil Lines Fatak, C-Scheme, Jaipur - 302005.
3. The District Collector, Beawar - 305901.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer - Masuda, District Beawar - 305623.
5. The Nagar Palika - Bijaynagar, District Beawar, Through Its Executive Officer / Commissioner - 305624.

-----Respondents

(55) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5483/2025

Mahendra Singh S/o Shri Vidhyadhar, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of 416, West Dhani, Narodara Tehsil Laxmangarh, District Sikar (Raj)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Director Cum Joint Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, G-3, Rajmahal Residencial Area, C-Scheme, Near Civil Line Phatak, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur Rajasthan.
4. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
5. The District Collector Sikar, District Sikar.
6. The Executive Officer, Municipality Laxmangarh, District Sikar.
7. The Sub Divisional Officer, Laxmangarh, District Sikar.
8. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Sikar.
9. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Laxmangarh District Sikar.

-----Respondents

(56) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5498/2025

Sangeeta D/o Sultana Ram W/o Mukesh Kumar, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Vpo Manasi, Tehsil Laxamangarh, District Sikar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Director Cum Special Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, G-3, Rajmahal Residencial Area, C-Scheme, Near Civil Line Phatak, Jaipur Rajasthan.
3. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

5. The District Collector Sikar, District Sikar, Rajasthan.
6. The Executive Officer, Nagar Palika, Laxmangarh, District Sikar, Rajasthan.
7. The Sub Divisional Officer, Laxmangarh, District Sikar, Rajasthan.
8. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Sikar.
9. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Laxmangarh, Sikar.

-----Respondents

(57) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5550/2025

Sangeeta Raj D/o Hanuman Raj, Aged About 45 Years, R/o 12 Dhanturi Thekda, Mahwa, Dausa (Rajasthan).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Government Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Director And Special Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan Jaipur.
4. The District Collector Dausa, District Dausa (Rajasthan)
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer And Sub Divisional Magistrate, Mahwa, District Dausa, (Rajasthan)
6. The Executive Officer, Municipal Board, Mahwa, District Dausa (Rajasthan).

-----Respondents

(58) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5583/2025

Banwari Lal S/o Shri Yadram Meena, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Ward No. 8, Meena Mohalla, Ramgarh, Dausa, District Dausa (Rajasthan)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Government

Secretary, Local Self Government Department,
Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat,
Rajasthan, Jaipur.

2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary,
Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan,
Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Director And Special Secretary, Local Self
Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan,
Jaipur.
4. The District Collector Dausa, District Dausa (Rajasthan)
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer And Sub Divisional Magistrate,
Mahwa, District Dausa (Rajasthan)
6. The Executive Officer, Municipal Board, Mahwa, District
Dausa (Rajasthan)

-----Respondents

(59) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5805/2025

Gram Panchayat-Ganeshpura, Panchayat Samiti- Dausa, District-
Dausa Through Sarpanch/ Administrator- Om Prakash Saini S/o
Chhajuram Saini, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Somnath Nagar,
Ganeshpura Road, Dausa.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Additional Chief
Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And
Panchayatiraj, Secretariat, Jaipur- 302005.
2. The Director And Special Secretary, Department Of Local
Self Government, G-3, Rajmahal Residency Area, Civil
Lines Phatak, C-Scheme, Jaipur- 302005.
3. The District Collector, Dausa- 305901.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer- Dausa, Distrit Dausa
5. The Nagar Parishad- Dausa, District Dausa Through Its
Commissioner.

-----Respondents

(60) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5826/2025

Babu Lal Yadav S/o Prabhu Dayal Yadav, Aged About 40 Years,
R/o Village Krishna Nagar, Gram Panchayat Chhopoli, Tehsil
Udaipurwati, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Jhunjhunu, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Udaipurwati, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jhunjhunu.
6. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Udaipurwati, Jhunjhunu.

----Respondents

(61) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5833/2025

Ruchita Saini W/o Shri Manoj Kumar Saini, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Dhanota Malpura, District Tonk, Administrator, Gram Panchayat Rindlya Bujurg, Panchayat Samiti Malpura, District Tonk.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Director Cum Principal Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Director Cum Joint Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, G-3, Rajmahal Residencial Area, C-Scheme, Near Civil Line Phatak, Jaipur-16, Rajasthan.
3. Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. Municipal Board Malpura, District Tonk, Through Its Executive Officer.
5. District Collector Tonk, District Tonk.

----Respondents

(62) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6124/2025

1. Vachan Singh Rawat S/o. Shri Nanu Singh Rawat, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Hathikeda, Foyasagar Road, Ajmer (Raj.) Presently Ward Panch, Ward No.2, Gram Panchayati Hathikheda, Panchayat Samiti, Ajmer Rural, Ajmer District Ajmer, Rajasthan.
2. Roop Singh S/o. Late Shri Chittar Singh, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Village Boraj, Foyasagar Road, Ajmer (Raj.) Presently Ward Panch, Ward No.8, Gram Panchayati Hathikheda, Panchayat Samiti, Ajmer Rural, Ajmer District Ajmer, Rajasthan.
3. Jagdish Prasad S/o Shri Nathu Lal, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Kajipura, Foyasagar Road, Ajmer, Presently Ward Panch, Ward No.11, Gram Panchayati Hathikheda, Panchayat Samiti, Ajmer Rural, Ajmer District Ajmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary Department Of Local Self, Government Of Rajasthan, Rajasthan Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Rajasthan Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
3. Director And Special Secretary, Local Self Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Rajasthan Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
4. District Collector, Ajmer, Collectorate Near Road Bus Stand, Ajmer, District Ajmer.
5. Commissioner Municipal Corporation, Ajmer.

-----Respondents

(63) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6191/2025

1. Raghuvirdayal Saini, S/o Sohan Lal, Aged About 56 Years, R/o Village Mojpur, Alwar, Rajasthan- 321633
2. Mausam Khan, S/o Nuruddin Khan, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Mojpur, Alwar, Rajasthan- 321633

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Urban Development And Housing, Rajasthan Secretariat, Jaipur



2. Director Cum Special Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Rajasthan, Jaipur Registered Office G-3 Raj Mahal Residency Area, Civil Lines, Jaipur, Rajasthan
3. District Collector, Alwar, Rajasthan
4. Executive Officer, Nagar Palika Laxmangarh, Distt. Alwar, Rajasthan
5. Sub Divisional Officer, Laxmangarh, Distt. Alwar, Rajasthan

-----Respondents

(64) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6485/2025

1. Subhash Chandra S/o Shri Ruda Ram, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Chota Pana Ki Dhani, Ward No. 9, Vijay Nagar, Palsana, District Sikar Rajasthan
2. Babulal S/o Shri Gopal, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Ward No. 10, Bada Pana, Palsana, Sikar Rajasthan
3. Babulal Bijarnia S/o Shri Choth Mal Bijarnia, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Ward No. 10, Tiba Ki Dhani, Vijay Nagar, Palsana, District Sikar Rajasthan
4. Ramdev S/o Shri Bhurram, Aged About 58 Years, R/o Ward No. 10, Palsana, District Sikar.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Director Cum Principal Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Principal Secretary, Rural Development Cum Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
3. Director Cum Joint Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, G-3, Rajmahal Residencial Area, C-Scheme, Near Civil Line Phatak, Jaipur-16, Rajasthan
4. The Director Collector, Sikar District Sikar Rajasthan
5. Municipal Board, Palsana District Sikar Rajasthan Its Executive Officer

-----Respondents

(65) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6648/2025

1. Asraf Khan S/o Dhanna Khan, Aged About 51 Years, R/o

Village Sajanpuri Post Hasanpur, Tehsil Laxmangarh,
Sajanpuri, Alwar, Rajasthan- 321607

2. Rupi S/o Samay Singh, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Sajanpuri, Alwar, Hasanpur, Alwar, Rajasthan- 321607

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Urban Development And Housing, Rajasthan Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Director Cum Special Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Rajasthan, Jaipur Registered Office G-3 Raj Mahal Residency Area, Civil Lines, Jaipur, Rajasthan
3. District Collector, Alwar, Rajasthan
4. Executive Officer, Nagar Palika Laxmangarh, Distt. Alwar, Rajasthan
5. Sub Divisional Officer, Laxmangarh, Distt. Alwar, Rajasthan

-----Respondents

(66) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6711/2025

Raghuveer Singh S/o Late Shri Randheer Singh, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Vilage Akhtadi, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Director Cum Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Tonk, Rajasthan.
3. Sub Divisional Magistrate, Malpura, District Tonk.

-----Respondents

(67) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6721/2025

Pooja Choudhary D/o Pawan Kumar Choudhary, W/o Deepak Choudhary, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Ward No. 11, Jodhpura, Kotputli, Tehsil Paota, District Kotputli-Behror.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of



Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.

2. Director Cum Special Secretary To The Government, Department Of Local Self Government Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Deputy Commissioner Cum Deputy Secretary To The Government (First), Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department (Panchayati Raj), Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, District Kotputli-Behror.

-----Respondents

(68) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6804/2025

Raju Lal Meena S/o Shri Ramji Lal Meena, Aged About 47 Years, R/o 442, Badwali Ka Baas, Thana, Alwar, Distt. Alwar (Rajasthan)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Government Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat Jaipur.
3. Director And Special Secretary Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan Jaipur.
4. District Collector Alwar, Distt. Alwar (Rajasthan)
5. Sub- Divisional Officer And Sub Divisional Magistrate, Alwar, Distt. Alwar (Rajasthan)
6. Executive Officer, Municipal Board Rajgarh, District Alwar (Rajasthan)

-----Respondents

(69) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6815/2025

Anil Kumar S/o Sh. Sheesh Ram, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Ward No.11, Near Power House, Kotkasim, Tehsil- Kotkasim, District- Khairthal -Tijara (Raj). (Paarsad Ward 11, Nagar Palika Kotkasim)

-----Petitioner

Versus



1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Parivahan Marg, Civil Line Phatak, Jaipur.
2. Director And Jt. Secretary, Dept. Of Local Self Govt., Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. Senior Joint Legal Remembrancer, Dept. Of Local Self Govt., Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. Sub-Division Officer Kotkasim, District- Khairthal-Tizara.
5. Nagar Palika Kotkasim, Through Executive Officer, Kotkasim District- Khairthal-Tizara.

-----Respondents

(70) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6871/2025

1. Sojiram Jat Son Of Shri Ramkuwar Jat, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Kashipuriya T. Fuliyakala District Bhilwara Division Ajmer
2. Ramprasad Bairwa Son Of Shri Kelash Bairwa, Aged About 26 Years, Tehsil Fuliyakala District Bhilwara Division Ajmer
3. Ramlal Khati Son Of Shri Rameshwar Khati, Aged About 68 Years, Village Kashipuriya Tehsil Fuliyakala District Bhilwara Division Ajmer

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary And Commissioner Panchayati Raj Department Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Divisional Commissioner, Ajmer Division Ajmer
3. District Collector (Panchayat), Bhilwara
4. Electoral Registration Officer Sub Divisional Officer, Division Ajmer Shahpura Bhilwara
5. Sub Divisional Officer, Fuliyakala District Bhilwara Division Ajmer

-----Respondents

(71) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6875/2025

Jaikam S/o Man Kha, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Ismailpur, Alwar, Ismailpur, Rajasthan, (Sarpanch Of Gram Panchayat, Jilota)


-----Petitioner

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Urban Development And Housing Department, Secretariat, Jaipur,
2. Chief Town Planner, Town Planning Department, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Khairtal-Tijara
4. Commissioner, Nagar Parishad, Khairtal

----Respondents

(72) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6906/2025

1. Bhanwar Lal Choudhary S/o Shri Bajrang Lal Jat, R/o Muwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Tordi, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk (Raj.)
2. Rajendra Kumar Choudhary S/o Shri Ramdhan Choudhary, R/o Muwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Tordi, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk (Raj.)
3. Ajay Choudhary S/o Shri Bhanwar Lal, R/o Muwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Tordi, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk (Raj.)
4. Ramsahay Meena S/o Shri Suraj Karan Meena, R/o Muwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Tordi, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk (Raj.)
5. Ramswaroop S/o Shri Devaram, R/o Muwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Tordi, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk (Raj.)
6. Babu Lal S/o Shri Mangilal Kahar, R/o Muwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Tordi, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk (Raj.)
7. Ramdhan S/o Shri Devaram Jat, R/o Muwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Tordi, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk (Raj.)
8. Khusiram S/o Shri Hansraj, R/o Muwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Tordi, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk (Raj.)
9. Ramawatar S/o Shri Bajrang Lal, R/o Muwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Tordi, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk (Raj.)
10. Ramehwar Prasad S/o Shri Suraj Karan Meena, R/o Muwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Tordi, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk (Raj.)
11. Ramswaroop Meena S/o Shri Bhanwar Meena, R/o Muwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Tordi, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk (Raj.)



12. Mukesh Kumar Meena S/o Shri Chothu Meena, R/o Muwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Tordi, Tehsil Malpura, District Tonk (Raj.)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Principal Secretary Department Of Local Bodies, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan
2. Directorate Of Local Bodies, Through Its Director Cum Special Secretary, Having Its Office At G3, Rajmahal Residency, Parivahan Marg, Shivaji Nagar, Civil Lines, Jaipur, Rajasthan 302007.
3. District Collector, Office Of The District Collector District Tonk, Rajasthan
4. Subdivisional Magistrate, Office Of The Sub District Tonk, Rajasthan

-----Respondents

(73) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6988/2025

1. Village Panchayat Ramsinghpura Through Its Administrator Monika Yadav, Aged About 42 Years Panchayat Samiti- Bahrod (Alvar), Rajasthan.
2. Village Panchayat Manchal Through Its Administrator Omprakash Yadav, Aged About 47 Years Panchayat Samiti- Bahrod (Alvar), Rajasthan.
3. Village Panchayar Jaguvas Through Its Administrator Annu Singh Aged About 27 Years Panchayat Samiti- Bahrod (Alvar), Rajasthan.
4. Village Panchayar Kharkhara Through Its Administrator Madanlal, Aged About 54 Years Panchayat Samiti- Bahrod (Kothputli-Bahrod), Rajasthan.
5. Village Panchayar Sherpur Through Its Administrator Abhay Singh Yadav, Aged About 55 Years Panchayat Samiti-Bahrod (Alvar), Rajasthan

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan Through Chief Secretary Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302005.
2. Svayatt Shasan Vibhag, Jaipur Through Special Administrative Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayat Raj Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

3. Block Development Officer, Bahrod, Kothputli, Rajasthan

-----Respondents

(74) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7032/2025

Villagers Of Revenue Village Kiradi, Gram Panchayat Hadoti, Panchayat Samiti, Sapotara, District Karauli Through Villager Ram Gopal Meena S/o Shri Prabhu Lal Meena, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Village Kiradi, Gram Panchayat Hadoti, Panchaya Samiti, Sapotara, District Karauli.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Karauli.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Sapotara, District Karauli.

-----Respondents

(75) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7033/2025

Villagers Of Revenue Village Gadhi Ka Gaon, As Also Dhani Shripura (Chamarpura), Gram Panchayat Hadoti, Panchayat Samiti, Sapotra, District Karauli Through Villager Ramesh Pal S/o Shri Shahjeet Pal, Aged About 66 Years, R/o Shripura, Revenue Village Gudhi Ka Gaon, Gram Panchayat Hadoti, Panchaya Samiti, Sapotara, District Karauli.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Karauli.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Sapotara, District Karauli.

-----Respondents

(76) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7043/2025

Sonu Kumari W/o Jitendra Pal, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Banwas, District Jhunjhunu, Raj. At Present Pradhan Panchayat Samiti Singhana, District Jhunjhunu, Raj.

-----Petitioner

Versus



1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Secretariate, Jaipur Rajasthan.
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Local Self Department, Government Secretariate, Jaipur.
3. Director And Special Secretary Administration, Local Self Department, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. Deputy Commissioner And Deputy Secretary Administration (I), Rural Development And Panchayat Raj.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Jila Parishad, Jhunjhunu, Raj.
6. District Collector, Jhunjhunu, Raj.
7. Smt. Sarla, Up Pradhan, Panchayat Samiti Singhana, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(77) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7131/2025

Bhavani Singh S/o Late Shri Jagdish Singh, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Gram Sirsya, Gram Panchayat Lasadiya, Tehsil Phagi District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Jaipur, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Phagi, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jaipur.
6. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Phagi, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(78) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7135/2025

Lal Singh S/o Shri Sukhdev Singh, Aged About 37 Years, R/o House No. 296, Talai Hathikheda, Foy Sagar Road, Ajmer Crf, Ajmer, Rajasthan.



-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan Jaipur.
3. The Director And Special Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
5. The Commissioner, Nagar Nigam, Ajmer.

-----Respondents

(79) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7141/2025

Dharmendra Singh S/o Shri Laxman Singh, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Dhani Shyorani, Post Devroad, Tehsil Pilani District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Jhunjhunu, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Surajgarh, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jhunjhunu.
6. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Pilani, Jhunjhunu.

-----Respondents

(80) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7164/2025

Deepika Sharma Wife Of Shri Vijayant Kumar Sharma, Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Bouhran Kothi, Jaun, Gram

Panchayat Dharanwas, Panchayat Samiti Nangal Rajawatan,
District Dausa (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

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 District Collector And District Magistrate, Dausa
(Raj.).
4. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Dausa (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(81) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7302/2025

Smt. Manju Devi Sharma, D/o Shri Mahaveer Prasad Sharma,
W/o Shri Mahendra Kumar Sharma, Aged About 45 Years,
Resident Of Village And Post Devan, Tehsil Shahpura, District
Jaipur, Rajasthan, At Present Holding Post Of Pradhan, Panchayat
Samiti Shahpura, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary,
Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj
Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government
Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Jaipur,
Rajasthan
3. Deputy Commissioner And Deputy Secretary-I,
Department Of Panchayati Raj, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur,
Rajasthan
4. District Collector, Jaipur
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Jaipur
6. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Shahpura,
District Jaipur

-----Respondents

(82) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7341/2025

Subhash Chand, S/o Dana Ram, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Gram

Jeenwas, Tehsil Danta Ramgarh, Jeenwas, Sikar, Rajasthan - 332406.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Sikar (Rajasthan).
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer (Sdm), Danta Ramgarh, Tehsil Danta Ramgarh, District Sikar, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(83) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7612/2025

1. Rupchand Meena S/o Shri Bishan Lal Meena, Aged About 49 Years, R/o Itawa, Po Jonla, Distt. Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan 322701.
2. Sher Singh Meena S/o Shri Dev Karan Meena, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Karela, Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan 322001
3. Prithviraj Meena S/o Shri Premchand Meena, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Kherli, Kalan, Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan 322001

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan.
6. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Khandar, Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(84) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7762/2025

Shakuntala W/o Shri Satish, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Jatoli Rathman, Bharatpur, Distt. Bharatpur (Rajasthan)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Government Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Director And Special Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector Bharatpur, District Bharatpur (Rajasthan)
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer And Sub Divisional Magistrate, Sear, District Bharatpur (Rajasthan)
6. The Executive Officer, Municipal Board, Bharatpur, District Bharatpur (Rajasthan)

-----Respondents

(85) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7857/2025

Jeeya Lal Saini S/o Shri Man Singh Saini, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village Kundera Dungar District Dausa (Rajasthan)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Government Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariate, Jaipur.
3. The Directorate And Special Secretary, Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan Jaipur.
4. The District Collector, Dausa, District Dausa.
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer And Sub Divisional Magistrate, Sikrai, District Dausa (Raj.)



6. The Executive Officer, Municipal Board, Sikrai, District Dausa (Rajasthan).

-----Respondents

(86) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8204/2025

Maya W/o Banbari Lal, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Goharpura, Post Sanwa, Tehsil And District Tonk Rajasthan

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj (Panchayati Raj Department) Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
2. District Collector Tonk, District Tonk
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Tonk
4. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Tonk, District Tonk

-----Respondents

(87) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.8269/2025


Smt. Manju Devi Sharma Age About 45 Years, Daughter of Shri Mahaveer Prasad Sharma, Wife of Shri Mahendra Kumar Sharma, Resident of Village and Post Devan, Tehsil Shahpura, District Jaipur, Rajasthan

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Rajasthan Through Additional Chief Secretary, Department of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Secretary, Department of Panchayati Raj, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Deputy Commissioner and Deputy Secretary-I, Department of Panchayati Raj, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan
4. The Principal Secretary, Department of Local Self Government, Government of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
5. Director and Special Secretary, Department of Local Self Government, Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur
6. District Collector, Jaipur
7. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Jaipur
8. Block Development Officer Panchayat Samiti Shahpura, District Jaipur
9. Smt. Pista Devi, Ward Member, Ward No.09, Panchayat

Samiti, Shahpura, District Jaipur



----Respondents

(88) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8347/2025

1. Madan Lal S/o Dhannaram, Aged About 50 Years, Residing At Village Turkasiya, Post Ghana, Gram Panchayat Ghirniya Bada, Panchayat Samiti Nechhva, District Sikar (Rajasthan).
2. Deendayal S/o Chandraram, Aged About 40 Years, Residing At Village Turkasiya, Post Ghana, Gram Panchayat Ghirniya Bada, Panchayat Samiti Nechhva, District Sikar (Rajasthan).
3. Vikas Khichar S/o Prahlad, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Jakhla, Gram Panchayat Suthoth, Panchayat Samiti Nechhva, District Sikar.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Authorized Officer (District Collector), Sikar, Panchayat Re-Constitution/recreation-2025, Room No. 31, Collectorate Premises, Sikar.
5. The Sub-Division Officer, Panchayat Samiti Nechhva, District Sikar.

----Respondents

(89) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8420/2025

1. Ramniwas Dhaka S/o Shri Jhabar Mal Dhaka, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Chak Kumliwala, Bhagatpura Abhaipura, District Sikar, Rajasthan.
2. Jagdish Prasad S/o Shaitanram, Aged About 64 Years, R/o Chak Kumliwala, Bhagatpura Abhaipura, District Sikar, Rajasthan.
3. Sagar Mal Yadav S/o Shri Sanwar Mal Yadav, Aged About

43 Years, R/o Near Bhairu Ji Mandir, Prithvipura, Tehsil Dantaramgarh, District Sikar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Authorized Officer (District Collector), Sikar, Panchayat Re-Constitution/recreation-2025, Room No. 31, Collectorate Premises, Sikar.
5. The Sub-Division Officer, Dantaramgarh, District Sikar.

-----Respondents

(90) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8468/2025

Rajpal S/o Shri Rameshwar Lal, R/o Village Brijlapura Tehsil Chidawa District Jhunjhunu Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur- 302005
2. The Seceretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Jhunjhunu, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Chidawa, District Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jhunjhunu.
6. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Chidawa, Jhunjhunu.

-----Respondents

(91) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8599/2025

1. Bhagirath Singh Dakha S/o Hanuta Ram, Aged About 67 Years, Resident Of Village - Basni, District Sikar, Rajasthan.
2. Harlal Singh S/o Chandra Ram, Aged About 74 Years, Resident Of Village - Basni, District Sikar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur-302005.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Sikar, District Sikar, Rajasthan.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Laxmangarh, District Sikar, Rajasthan.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Sikar.
6. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Laxmangarh, District Sikar, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(92) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8626/2025

1. Shankar Lal Meena S/o Siya Ram Meena, Aged About 53 Years, R/o Vill. Phoosoda, Gram Panchayat Chharoda, Tehsil And Distt. Sawai Madhopur (Rajasthan)
2. Moji Ram Meena S/o Ram Kumar Meena, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Chharoda, Tehsil And Distt Sawai Madhopur (Rajasthan).
3. Ram Raj Meena S/o Sheoji Ram Meena, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Village Jamool Khera, Gram Panchayat Chharoda, Tehsil And Distt. Sawai Madhopur (Rajasthan)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Addl. Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary- Cum-Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of

Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

3. The District Collector, Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan.
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Sawai Madhopur, Rajasthan.
6. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Sawai Madhopur.

-----Respondents

(93) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8670/2025

Gram Panchayat Nani, Through Its Sarpanch Mohan Lal S/o Shri-Nathu Ram Aged About-41 Years, R/o- Village-Nani, Sihot Chootti Tehsil-Dhodh, District Sikar, Raj.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Jaipur, Rajasthan
3. The Deputy Commissioner And Deputy Secretary-1, Department Of Panchayati Raj. Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan
4. The District Collector, Sikar.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Sikar.
6. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Dhodh, Dist- Sikar.

-----Respondents

(94) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8714/2025

Gram Panchayat Bhadwasi, Through Its Sarpanch Vimla Devi W/o- Shri Gangadhar Singh, age About-57 Years, r/o- Village-Bhadwasi Tehsil-And District Sikar, Raj.

-----Petitioner

Versus

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

Secretariat, Jaipur.

2. The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Jaipur, Rajasthan
3. The Deputy Commissioner And Deputy Secretary-1, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan
4. The District Collector, Sikar.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Sikar.
6. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Piprali, Dist- Sikar.

----Respondents

(95) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8718/2025

Gram Panchayat Shivsinghpura, Through Its Sarpanch Mahaveer Prasad Saini S/o- Raju Ram Saini.age About- 65 Years, r/o- Shivsinghpura, Tehsil-And District Sikar, Raj.

----Petitioner

Versus


1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Jaipur, Rajasthan
3. The Deputy Commissioner And Deputy Secretary-1, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan
4. The District Collector, Sikar.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Sikar.
6. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, piprali, dist- Jaipur.

----Respondents

(96) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8801/2025

1. Hari Kishan Meena Son Of Ramjilal Meena, Aged About 66 Years, R/o 213, Bhairu Bas, Kalwari, District Alwar
2. Vikram Meena S/o Raju Lal Meena, R/o Bhairu Bas, Kalwari, District Alwar
3. Bholaram Meena S/o Gangadhar Meena, R/o Villae

Bhairubas, Kalwari, District Alwar



-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayatiraj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Alwar.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Kathumar, District Alwar.

-----Respondents

(97) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8807/2025

1. Ajay Kumar Meena Son Of Pappu Ram Meena, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Ganwadi, Khudiyana, Tehsil Laxmangarh District Alwar
2. Hariram S/o Pancharam, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Village Ganwadi, Khudiyana, Tehsil Laxmangarh, District Alwar
3. Ramsahai Meena S/o Ghisoli Ram, R/o Ward No. 14, Meena Bas, Ganwadi, Khudiyana, Tehsil Laxmangarh District Alwar
4. Shivcharan Meena S/o Nannu Ram Meena, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Ganwadi, Khudiyana, Tehsil Laxmangarh District Alwar
5. Ramchanran Meena S/o Chhaju Ram Meena, Aged About 66 Years, R/o Ganwadi Jawli, Tehsil Laxmangarh, District Alwar
6. Sanjay Kumar Meena S/o Ramcharan Meena, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Ganwadi Khudiyana, Tehsil Laxmangarh, District Alwar
7. Nannu S/o Sampat, Aged About 79 Years, R/o Ward No. 14, Meena Bas, Ganwadi, Khudiyana, Tehsil Laxmangarh District Alwar

-----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 District Collector, Alwar.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Laxmangarh, District Alwar.

-----Respondents

(98) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8868/2025

Sarvan Kumar S/o Dhannaram, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Ward No. 11, Village Ratanpura, Teh. Nohar, District Hanumangarh, Rajasthan, 335523

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj).
2. Commissioner And Deputy Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayat Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Collector, Hanumangarh Rajasthan-335523

-----Respondents

(99) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9040/2025

Aaam Janta Village Gaondiapura Gram Panchayat Raghuvanshi, Tehsil And District Karauli Through Man Singh Son Of Shri Ramkhiladi, Aged About 58 Years, Ex- Sarpanch, Resident Of Village Gaondiapura Gram Panchayat Raghuvanshi, Tehsil And District Karauli (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Village Development And Panchayatiraj Department (Panchayatiraj Department), Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Karauli, District Karauli (Raj.)
3. Tehsildar, Tehsil Karauli, District Karauli (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(100) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9059/2025

1. Ratan Lal Verma Son Of Shri Nathuram, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Ramla Ka Bass, Tehsil Kalwar, District Jaipur (Raj.)



2. Chhitar Mal Jat Son Of Shri Murliram Jat, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of Ramla Ka Bass, Tehsil Kalwar, District Jaipur (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Village Development And Panchayati Raj Department (Panchayatiraj Department), Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jaipur (Rural), District Jaipur (Raj.)
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Jaipur (Rural), Collectorate Campus, Jaipur (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(101) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9187/2025

1. Gram Panchayat Nisoora, Through Its Administrator Lakhana Devi W/o Nanguram, Aged About 62 Years, Beech Ki Patti, Nisoora, Karauli, Rajasthan-322220
2. Gram Panchayat Kirwara, Through Its Administrator Mahesh Chand Meena S/o Motilal Meena, Aged About 54 Years, Kirwara, Karauli, Pahadiyanagar, Rajasthan-322220

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Commissioner And Deputy Secretary Of Government, Rural Development And Panchayat Raj Department, Secretary, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The District Collector Of Karauli, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(102) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9199/2025

1. Sanwar Mal Chaudhary S/o Late. Shri Mangi Lal, Aged About 51 Years, Ex Chairman, Gram Seva Sahkari Samiti Patwari Ka Bas R/o Village - Patwari Ka Bas.
2. Smt. Radha Devi W/o Late Shri Bhagwan Singh, Sarpanch Cum Administrator Gram Panchayat - Lampuwa, R/o Chakki Ke Pass Village Lampuwa
3. Surendra Beniwal S/o Shri Moti Ram Baniwal, Chairman,

Gram Seva Sahkari Samiti Limited Sargoth At Present R/o
Nh 52 Village, Sargoth.

4. Sita Ram Pawanda S/o Sh. Jhuntha Ram, R/o Dhani Pawanda Sagar, Village -. Tehsil Ringas, Dist. Sikar Raj.
5. Smt. Santra Devi W/o Shri Kailash Bajiya, Sarpanch Cum Administrator Gram Panchayat - Tapiplya R/o Ward No. 1 Dhani Rajwali Village Tapiplya.
6. Kailash Chandra S/o Hanuman Ram, Ex. Sarpanch Gram Panchayat-Tapiplya R/o Dhani Rajwali Ward No. 1 Village Tapiplya.
7. Smt.krishna Kumar Jat W/o Shri Sanwar Choudhary, Sarpanch Cum Administrator, Gram Panchayat Patwari Ka Bas R/o Ward No. 6 Village Patwari Ka Bas.
8. Jitendra Singh S/o Sh. Bhagwan Singh, Member Panchayat Samiti Khandela R/o Ward No. 6 Village Lampuwa.
9. Mali Ram S/o Sh. Chhotu Ram, R/o Village Bawri.
10. Smt. Paanchi Devi W/o Shri Mohan Lal, Sarpanch Cum Administrator Gram Panchayat - Aabhawas, R/o Ward No. 16 Village Abhawas.
11. Suraj Bhan Singh S/o Sh. Jagdish Prasad, R/o Ward No. 5 Dhani Aalanpur Village -. Malikpur,
12. Sohan Lal S/o Sh. Mangla Ram, R/o Dhani Sakuniya Ki Village Shahpura Gram Panchayat Thikria
13. Birbal Singh S/o Sh. Hira Singh, At Present R/o Village Malakali.
14. Sagar Mal Dhayal S/o Sh. Rugha Ram, R/o Dhani Bada Wali Village Kotri Dhayalan.
15. Dhoor Singh S/o Sh. Bodu Ram, Ex. Sarpanch Gram Panchayat-Malikpur R/o Ward No. 10 Dhani Shara Wali Village Gyanpura Gram Panchyat Malikpur.
16. Suresh Kumar S/o Sh. Bheru Ram, R/o Ward No.8 Dhani Sagar Village Dadiya Rampura
17. Chhitar Mal Mahala S/o Sh. Hira Lal, R/o Ward No. 7 Village-. Dadiya Rampura
18. Sita Ram Aachra S/o Sh. Nathu Ram Achara, R/o Village Dheerajpura.
19. Mohan Lal Yadav S/o Shree Mansa Ram Yadav, Sarpanch Cum Administrator Gram Panchayat - Sargoth. R/o Ward



No.10 Chani Kakodiya Wali Village Sargoth.

20. Rajesh Kumar Dhayal S/o Sh. Bhagata Ram, R/o Dhani Dhayalo Wali Village-. Chomu Purohitan.
21. Govind Ram S/o Sh. Hanuman, Ex Sarpanch Gram Panchayat-Thikria, R/o Dhani Bajiya Wali Village - Thikria,
22. Sankar Lal S/o Shri Bhura Ram, Aged About 99 Years, Sarpanch Cum Administrator Gram Panchayat - Kansrada, R/o Ward No. 2 Dhani Dhaba Wali Village Kansrada
23. Shimbhu Dayal S/o Sh. Shayama Ram, R/o Ward No. 11 Village Jaitusar
24. Bhuda Ram Bagaria S/o Sh. Bhana Ram, R/o Alanpur Village-. Malikpur.
25. Ashok Kumar Samota S/o Sh. Kishan Lal, R/o Dhani Samota Wali Village- Tapiplya.
26. Gopal Singh S/o Sh. Ramu Ram, Ex. Sarpanch Gram Panchayat Bawari, R/o Ward No. 8 Dhani Hanuman Baba Wali Village Baori
27. Neki Ram S/o Sh. Munga Ram, R/o Pipalya Ki Dhani Village Kansrada.
28. Mukti Lal S/o Sh. Sukhdev Prasad, Member Panchayat Samiti Khandela R/o Ward No. 3, New Colony Village Jaitusar.
29. Bahadur Singh Bajiya S/o Shri Govind Singh Bajiya, Ex.chairman, Gram Seva Sahkari Samiti, Lakhani, R/o Dhani Ram Sagar Villa Lakhani
30. Prem Prakash S/o Sh. Surendra Singh, R/o Ward No. 3 Village Kotri Dhayalan.
31. Ranveer Ghatala S/o Shri Gordhan Ghatala, R/oward No. 10 Village, Sounthaliya, Post-Bawari.
32. Jorawar Singh S/o Shri Bhagwana Ram, R/o Ward No. 9 Pawanda Ki Dhani, Village Baori. All Of At Present Tehsil Ringas Dist. Sikar. Raj.
33. Birdi Chand S/o Sh. Kana Ram, R/o Village Aabhawas.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Secretary To Government And Commissioner, Rural

Development And Panchayati Raj Department Govt. Of Rajasthan Secretariat Jaipur.

3. Deputy Secretary Government And Deputy Commissioner (1St), Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Govt. Of Rajasthan Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. District Collector Cum Authorized Officer, Panchayat Recorganization/new Creation 2025, Sikar.
5. Sub-Divisional Officer Khandela Cum Authorized Officer, Panchayat Reorganization/new Creation 2025, Sub-Divisional, Khandela, Dist. Sikar.
6. Sub Divisional Officer, Reengus, Dist. Sikar.
7. Tehsildar, Reengus, Dist. Sikar.

-----Respondents

(103) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9206/2025

Gram Panchayat Dilwara, Through Its Administrator Munni Devi Gurjar W/o Gheesa Lala Gurjar, Age About 47 Years, R/o Village Bewanja, Teh. Nasirabad, District Ajmer, Rajasthan, 305601

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Commissioner And Deputy Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
3. District Collector, Ajmer, Rajasthan.
4. Sub Divisional Magistrate, Nasirabad, Ajmer, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(104) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9221/2025

Mahendra Singh S/o Bhanwar Singh Rathore, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Nari Bari, Sikar (Raj.)-332301.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Governance And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Dy. Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department,

Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)

3. District Collector, Sikar (Raj.)
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Fatehpur Shekhawati, District Sikar (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(105) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9222/2025

Rangpal Singh Rathore S/o Khuman Singh Rathore, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Thithawata Peeran, Sikar (Raj.) - 332301

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Governance And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Dy. Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
3. District Collector, Sikar (Raj.)
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Fatehpur Shekhawati, District Sikar (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(106) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9363/2025

Village Panchayat 2 Knj, Through Its Administrator Jivani W/o Shiv Kumar, Aged About 57 Years, Ward No. 20, I.t.i. Basti - Hanumangarh, Rajasthan-335512.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302003
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Deputy Commissioner And Deputy Government Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Collector, Hanumangarh, Rajasthan-335512

-----Respondents

(107) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9364/2025

Gram Panchayat Kharavali, Through Its Administrator Kale Khan, S/o Ranjhe Khan, Aged About 40 Years, 4 A R M, Kharavali, Chhatargarh, District Bikaner P O Chhatargarh State Rajasthan-334021

-----Petitioner

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302003
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Deputy Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302003
3. District Collector, Bikaner, Rajasthan- 334021

-----Respondents

(108) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9385/2025

Gram Panchayat Bhatsuri, Through Its Administrator Ramdev Gurjar, S/o Bhiya Ram, Aged About 45 Years, Village Hanumantpura, Teh. Kalesara, Ajmer, Rajasthan-305204.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchyati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302003.
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Deputy Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchyati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302003.
3. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchyati Raj, Government, Rajasthan-321204.
4. Development Officer Of Panchayat Samiti Pisangan, Ajmer, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(109) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9399/2025

Gram Panchayat Banera, Through Its Administrator Sampat Mali S/o Sharwan Laal Mali, Aged About 36 Years, Purohit Mohalla, Banera, Bhilwara, Rajasthan 311401.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302003
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Deputy Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302003

3. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Director And Special Secretary Of Local Self Government Department Raj, Government, Rajasthan-321204.
4. Development Officer Of Panchayat Samiti Banera, Bhilwara, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(110) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9403/2025

Gram Panchayat Gokulpura, Through Its Sarpanch Harpyar W/o- Shri Omprakash, Age About-61 Years, R/o- Gokulpura Jyoti Nagar, Piprali Road,tehsil And District Sikar, Raj.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Deputy Commissioner And Deputy Secretary-1, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Raj.
3. The Director Cum Deputy Secretary Local Self, Government Department, Near Civil Line Phatak, Jaipur, Raj.
4. The District Collector, Sikar.
5. The Commissioner, Nagar Parishad-Sikar, Raj.
6. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Sikar.
7. Block Development Officer Panchayat Samiti, Piprali,dist-Sikar.

-----Respondents

(111) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9405/2025

Gram Panchayat Kudli, Through Its Sarpanch Santosh W/o- Shri Prabhu Dayal,age About-59 Years, r/o- Kudli,tehsil And District Sikar, Raj.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.



2. The Deputy Commissioner And Deputy Secretary-1, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Raj.
3. The Director Cum Deputy Secretary Local Self, Government Department, Near Civil Line Phatak, Jaipur, Raj.
4. The District Collector, Sikar.
5. The Commissioner, Nagar Parishad-Sikar, Raj.
6. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Sikar.
7. Block Development Officer Panchayat Samiti, Piprali,dist-Sikar.

-----Respondents

(112) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9424/2025

Gram Panchayat Kathaul, Through Its Adminstrator Sharifan, W/o Akbar Aged About 58 Years, Village Thalchana, Teh. Pahari, Thalchana, Bharatpur, Rajasthan- 321204

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur Rajasthan- 302003
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Deputy Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur Rajasthan- 302003
3. District Collector, Deeg, Rajasthan- 321204

-----Respondents

(113) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9426/2025

Gram Panchayat Deval, Through Its Administrator Nirmal Kanwar W/o Govind Raj Singh, Aged 37 Years, Near Gadh, Buddha Deval, Tonk, Rajasthan-304503

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Deputy Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)



3. Local Self Government, Through Director And Special Secretary To Government, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(114) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9427/2025

Village Panchayat Bhojato Ka Oda, Through Its Administrator Lalita Devi Ahari W/o Mukesh Ahari, Aged About 38 Years, Bhojato Ka Oda, Dungarpur, Rajasthan- 314034

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Local Self Department Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302003
2. Commissioner And Deputy Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Collector, Dungarpur Rajasthan 314034

-----Respondents

(115) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9428/2025

Gram Panchayat Kaladera, Through Its Administrator Ashok Kumar Sharma S/o Tej Prakash Sharama, Aged About 51 Years, 274, Ward No. 12, Masjid Ke Pass, Kaladera, Kaladera, Jaipur, Rajasthan-303801.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302003
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Deputy Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302003
3. State Of Rajasthan, Through Director And Special Secretary Of Local Self Department Of Rajasthan, Rajasthan-303801, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(116) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9434/2025

1. Akash S/o Ram Swaroop, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Gram Ladampur, District Dholpur, Rajasthan 328024
2. Phateh Singh S/o Narayan Singh, Aged About 53 Years, R/o Gram Ladampur, Hinota District Dholpur, Rajasthan 328024



-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Dholpur (Rajasthan).
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer (Sdm), Dholpur, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(117) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9456/2025

1. Smt. Sushila Devi W/o Babulal Achra, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village Dheerajpura, Post Lakhni, Via Reengus, District Sikar, Presently Administrator Gram Panchayat Chomu Purohitan, Tehsil Reengus, Panchayat Samiti Khandela, District Sikar
2. Sitaram Achra S/o Shri Nathuram Ji Achra, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Dheerajpura, Post Lakhni, Via Reengus, Tehsil Reengus, District Sikar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The Deputy Commissioner Cum Deputy Secretary-I, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
5. The Authorized Officer (District Collector), Sikar, Panchayat Re-Constitution/recreation-2025, Room No. 31, Collectorate Premises, Sikar.
6. The Sub-Division Officer, Khandela, District Sikar.
7. Subhash Meel S/o Shri Hanuman, R/o Sonthaliya, Post Baodi, Tehsil Reengus, District Sikar, Presently Residing At Opp. Bijli Board, Khandela, District Sikar-332709, Rajasthan, Presently Holding The Post Of Member Of

Legislative Assembly, Khandela, District Sikar.

-----Respondents

(118) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9509/2025

1. Villagers Of Revenue Village Pipalpura, Gram Panchayat Sengarpura, Panchayat Samiti, Karauli, District Karauli Through Villager Harkesh Singh, S/o Shri Maharaj Singh, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village Pipalpura, Panchayat Samity, Karauli, District Karauli.
2. Villagers Of Revenue Village Aadi-Hudpura, Gram Panchayat Sengarpura, Panchayat Samiti, Karauli, District Karauli Through Villager Meghram, S/o Shri Kumdan, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Village Aadi-Hudpura, Panchayat Samity, Karauli, District Karauli.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. District Collector, Karauli
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Karauli, District Karauli

-----Respondents

(119) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9538/2025

1. Jai Kishan S/o Late Shri Chandlal Meena, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Village Ramajpura, Tehsil Indergarh, District Bundi, Rajasthan. (Ex- Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Babai).
2. Vimal Kumar Jain S/o Late Shri Ratan Lal, Aged About 66 Years, R/o Village Ramajpura, Tehsil Indergarh, District Bundi, Rajasthan.
3. Shivpal S/o Shri Gyarsilal Meena, Aged About 74 Years, R/o Village Ramajpura, Tehsil Indergarh, District Bundi, Rajasthan.
4. Sukhpal S/o Shri Rajaram Meena, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Ramajpura, Tehsil Indergarh, District Bundi, Rajasthan.
5. Mastram S/o Shri Shankar Lal Meena, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Village Ramajpura, Tehsil Indergarh, District Bundi, Rajasthan.
6. Rameshwar S/o Shri Kalu Meena, Aged About 58 Years,



R/o Village Ramajpura, Tehsil Indergarh, District Bundi, Rajasthan.

7. Dayaram S/o Shri Chandlal Prajapat, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village Ramajpura, Tehsil Indergarh, District Bundi, Rajasthan.
8. Radheshyam S/o Shri Bherulal Meena, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Ramajpura, Tehsil Indergarh, District Bundi, Rajasthan.
9. Bharat Lal S/o Shri Motilal Meena, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Village Ramajpura, Tehsil Indergarh, District Bundi, Rajasthan.
10. Dharmendra S/o Suwalal Meena, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Village Ramajpura, Tehsil Indergarh, District Bundi, Rajasthan.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Bundi, Rajasthan.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer (SDO), Tehsil Indergarh, District Bundi.

----Respondents

(120) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9640/2025

Ganesh Ram Jaat Son Of Shri Ramkishan Jat, Aged About 59 Years, Resident Of Rojho Ka Mohalla, Behind Senior Secondary School, Dooni, District Tonk (Rajasthan).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Deputy Commissioner And Deputy Secretary-I, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Govt. Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

4. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
5. Director And Special Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
6. District Collector, Tonk.
7. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Tonk.
8. Sub Divisional Officer, Sub-Division, Deoli, District Tonk.
9. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Deoli, District Tonk.
10. Shri Banwari Lal, Panchayat Samiti Member, Ward No. 20, Panchayat Samiti Deoli, District Tonk.

-----Respondents

(121) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9641/2025

Ramesh Chand Nagar S/o Shri Ramprahalad, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village Kohni, Post Bamori Ghata, Tehsil And Panchayat Chhipabarod, District Baran, Rajasthan- 325221.

-----Petitioner


Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Governance And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Dy. Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
3. District Collector, Baran (Raj.)
4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Chhipabarod, District Baran (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(122) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9679/2025

1. Sunita Kumawat W/o Shri Kamlesh Kumar, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village- Kharana, Tehsil- Jamwaramgarh, District- Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Bajrang Lal Sharma S/o Shri Kajodmal Sharma, Aged About 66 Years, Resident Of Village- Kharana, Tehsil- Jamwaramgarh, District- Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Sitaram Tailor S/o Shri Chhoturam, Aged About 72 Years, Resident Of Village- Kharana, Tehsil- Jamwaramgarh, District- Jaipur, Rajasthan.



4. Trilok Chand Jain S/o Uttam Chand Jain, Aged About 47 Years, Resident Of Village- Kharana, Tehsil- Jamwaramgarh, District- Jaipur, Rajasthan.
5. Chhitarmal Sitaram S/o Shri Sujilal, Aged About 54 Years, Resident Of Village- Kharana, Tehsil- Jamwaramgarh, District- Jaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, District- Jaipur.
4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Jamwaramgarh, Jaipur.
5. Tehsildar, Tehsil- Jamwaramgarh, District- Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(123) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9750/2025

Manoj Kumar Meena S/o Lakshman Singh, Aged About 41 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 8, Purana Gaon, Bhagwanpura, Chhipabarod, District Baran, Rajasthan-325221

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Governance And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Dy. Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
3. District Collector, Baran (Raj.)
4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Chhipabarod, District Baran (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(124) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9860/2025

Dharmpal S/o Bajrang Lal, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Kumharo Ka Bass, Bhapar, Kajara, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary,



Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj
Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government
Secretariat, Jaipur.

2. Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj
Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government
Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Jhunjhunu, District Jhunjhunu,
Rajasthan.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jhunjhunu

-----Respondents

(125) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9940/2025

Mahendra Yadav S/o Shri Sahab Singh, Aged About 39 Years,
R/o Guwadi, Kasbanonera, Baran, Rajasthan- 325217

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Government Secretary,
Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department,
Rajasthan.
2. District Collector, Baran, Rajasthan.
3. Sub Divisional Magistrate, Shahabad, District Baran,
Rajasthan.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, District Baran,
Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(126) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9957/2025

Ramdev Singh S/o Harji, Gram Shyopura, Tehsil Masuda, Po
Deomali, District Beawar, Ajmer Rajasthan - 305623

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Rural
Development And Panchayati Raj Department,
Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The District Collector, Beawar (Rajasthan)
3. The Sub- Divisional Officer (Sdm), Village - Shyopura,
Tehsil- Masuda, District- Beawar, Rajasthan

-----Respondents

(127) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9964/2025

Sukhdev S/o Hari, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Village Devgarh, Tehsil - Masuda, Deomali, District Beawar, Ajmer, Rajasthan-305623.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Beawar (Rajasthan).
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer (Sdm), Village - Devgarh, Tehsil - Masuda, District - Beawar, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(128) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9974/2025

1. Ram Kanwar S/o Sh. Sagra Ram Gurjar, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Post- Kuhada, Tehsil- Viratnagar, District- Kotputli Behror Rajasthan.
2. Deshraj Gurjar S/o Sh. Birduram Gurjar, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Kakrana Bada, Post- Kuhada, Tehsil- Viratnagar, District- Kotputli Behror Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, State Secretariat, Bhagwan Das Road, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. District Collector (Panchayat), Kotputli- Behror (Raj.)
3. Sub- Divisional Officer, Tehsil- Viratnagar, District- Kotputli- Behror (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(129) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10064/2025

1. All Villagers Of Village Mohmadpur, Tehsil Chhabra, Distt. Baran (Raj) Through Ramnarayan S/o Jankilal Aged About 55 Years, R/o Village Mohmadpur, Tehsil Chhabra, Distt. Baran (Raj).
2. All Villagers Of Village Manakchowk, Tehsil Chhabra, Distt. Baran (Raj). Through Mukesh Kumar S/o Omkarlal Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Manakchowk, Tehsil Chhabra, Distt. Baran (Raj).

-----Petitioners

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Department, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj).
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Department, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj).
3. The District Collector Baran, District Baran (Raj).
4. The District Sub Divisional Officer, Chhabra Distt. Baran (Raj).

-----Respondents

(130) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10069/2025

All Villagers Of Vilage Rahron, Village Panchayat Bapcha, Tehsil Chhabra, Distt. Baran (Raj.) Through Shrikishan S/o Shri Bishan Lal Aged About 55 Years, R/o Village Rahron, Village Panchayat Bapcha, Tehsil Chhabra, Distt. Baran Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj. Department, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj. Department, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
3. The District Collector Baran, Distt. Bara (Raj.)
4. The District Sub Divisional Officer, Chhabra, Distt. Baran (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(131) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.10322/2025

Sh. Mohan Lal Jat S/o Sh. Narayan Lal Jat, Aged About 59 Years R/o 137, Sundo Ki Dhani, Kheerwa, Kheri Milak, District Jaipur, Rajasthan

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Rajasthan Through Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan,

Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

3. The District Collector, Jaipur District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Jobner, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jaipur.

6. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Jobner, District Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(132) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10427/2025

Gram Panchayat Kannoj, Through Its Administrator Manju Devi Jagetiya W/o Girdhari Laal Aged About 58 Years, 630,2/3 Bhag, Kannoj, Kannoj, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan 312613

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur Rajasthan- 302003
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Deputy Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur Rajasthan- 302003
3. State Of Rajasthan, Through The District Collector Chittorgarh, Rajasthan 312613
4. Development Officer Of Panchayat Samiti Bedeshar, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan 312613

-----Respondents

(133) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10541/2025

Gram Panchayat Jeelola, Through Its Administrator Ram Laal S/o Kishan Laal, Aged About 68 Years, Bhadla, Bhadla, Rajsamand, Rajasthan, 313334

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302003.
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Deputy Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302003.
3. State Of Rajasthan, Through The District Collector, Rajsamand, Rajasthan 313334

-----Respondents

(134) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10542/2025

Gram Panchayat Peepli Acharayaan, Through Its Administrator
Sundar Devi W/o Manohar Laa Keer Aged About 46 Years, Sadar
Bazar, Peepli Acharyan, Mahalon Ki Pipli, Rajsamand, Rajasthan,
313334

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302003
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Deputy Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan- 302003
3. State Of Rajasthan, Through The District Collector Rajsamand, Rajasthan, 313334

-----Respondents

(135) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10556/2025

Gopi Lal Son Of Shri Raymal, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village-
Piloda, Tehsil Bhinay, District Ajmer Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Ajmer, District Ajmer.
3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Bhinay, District Ajmer.
4. Tehsildar, Bhinay, District Ajmer.
5. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Bhinay, District Ajmer.

-----Respondents

(136) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.10644/2025

1. Chandan Singh S/o Nandan Singh, Aged 80 Years, R/o Village Nagla Bhattki, Unchera, District Deeg (Raj.)
2. Shyam Singh S/o Shri Bhikkan Singh, Aged 60 Years, R/o Village Bhattki, Post Unchera, District Deeg (Raj.)
3. Kamal Singh S/o Shri Jasram, Aged 47 Years, R/o Village Bhattki, Post Uncheda, Tehsil Kaman, District Deeg (Raj.)

4. Digambar S/o Shri Govind, Aged 46 Years, R/o Village Nagla Bhattki, Unchera, District Deeg Raj.

5. Bhupram S/o Shri Chhitraya, Aged 72 Years, R/o Village Nagla Bhattki, Unchera, District Deeg (Raj.)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Rajasthan Through The Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

3. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)

4. The District Collector, Deeg, District Deeg (Raj.)

5. The Sub Divisional Magistrate, Kaman, District Deeg (Raj.)

---Respondents

(137) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11046/2025

Devicharan S/o Bheekaram, Aged About 47 Years, 1, 1, Rahsena, Po Lalpur Rehsena, Dholpur, Rajasthan, 328029

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302003

2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Deputy Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302003

3. State Of Rajasthan, Through The District Collector Dholpur, Rajasthan, 313334

-----Respondents

(138) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.11068/2025

Om Shiv Pratap Singh S/o Bhagwati Singh, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Maheshwas, Bichoon, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.


---Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Rajasthan Through Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Government Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

3. The District Collector, Jaipur, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.



4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sambhar Lake, District Jaipur, Rajasthan.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jaipur.
6. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Sambhar Lake, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(139) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11401/2025

Gram Vikas Committee Siyakhoh, Gram Panchayat Menpur, Tehsil Mundawat, District Khairthal-Tijara, Rajasthan Through Its Authorized Representative Shri Devender Kumar S/o Shri Mahender Kumar Yadav, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Siyakhoh, Tehsil Mundawar, District Khairthal-Tijara, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Panchayati Raj Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Khairthal-Tijara, Agro Tower, Krishi Mandi Campus, Khairthal (Raj.)
3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Mundawat, District Khairthal-Tijara (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(140) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11606/2025

Gram Panchayat Sodar, Through Its Administrator Goapl Lal Jat S/o Kalyan Mal Jat Aged About 53 Years, Inanikheda, inanikheda , Sodar, Bhilwara, Rajasthan, 311024

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302003
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Deputy Secretary Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan-302003
3. State Of Rajasthan, Through The District Collector Bhilwara, Rajasthan, 311024

-----Respondents

**(Matters listed at Jodhpur)
(Through V.C.)
Connected with**

(1) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8576/2025

1. Dhannaram S/o Chunaram Prajapat, Aged About 57 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
2. Bhomsingh S/o Indrasingh Rajput, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
3. Punamchand S/o Badrinarayan Darji, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
4. Kapildev S/o Badrinarayan Darji, Aged About 41 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
5. Taruna W/o Punama Chand Darji, Aged About 43 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
6. Ganesh S/o Nathuram Prajapat, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
7. Govindram S/o Nathuram Prajapat, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
8. Amra Ram S/o Kojaram Bishnoi, Aged About 67 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
9. Hariram S/o Kojaram Bishnoi, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
10. Somraj S/o Kishnaram Bishnoi, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
11. Nainaram S/o Ramuram Prajapat, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
12. Aaidanram S/o Ramuram Prajapat, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

13. Kishnaram S/o Sukharam Prajapat, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
14. Kasumbi W/o Chunaram Prajapat, Aged About 73 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
15. Om Prakash S/o Dannaram Prajapat, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
16. Mukesh S/o Dhannaram Prajapat, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
17. Champalal S/o Chunaram Prajapat, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
18. Kailash S/o Dhannaram Prajapat, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
19. Dhani Devi W/o Nathuram Prajapat, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
20. Rajuram S/o Kanaram Bishnoi, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
21. Budharam S/o Kanaram Bishnoi, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
22. Sarita W/o Manak Bishnoi, Aged About 20 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
23. Mohini W/o Kishnaram Bishnoi, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
24. Sidharam S/o Himataram Jat, Aged About 75 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
25. Gainaram S/o Sidararamjat, Aged About 41 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

26. Harku W/o Sidaram Jat, Aged About 74 Years, Resident Of Village Shivrinar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
27. Samu W/o Gainaram Jat, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village Shivrinar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
28. Amararam S/o Sidaram Jat, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Village Shivrinar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
29. Prahalad S/o Aamraram Jat, Aged About 20 Years, Resident Of Village Shivrinar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
30. Sunil S/o Aamraram Jat, Aged About 49 Years, Resident Of Village Shivrinar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
31. Prem S/o Aamraram Jat, Aged About 18 Years, Resident Of Village Shivrinar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
32. Meera W/o Aamraram Jat, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Shivrinar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
33. Ravisankar S/o Bhomaram Jat, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Shivrinar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
34. Bhanwaridevi W/o Bhomaram Jat, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Village Shivrinar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
35. Alaram S/o Sukharam Prajapat, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Village Shivrinar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
36. Geeta W/o Alaram Prajapat, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Village Shivrinar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
37. Manaram S/o Alaram Prajapat, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village Shivrinar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
38. Dhatu W/o Govindram Prajapat, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village Shivrinar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

39. Bhanwari Devi W/o Aaidanram Prajapat, Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
40. Magi Devi W/o Kesharam Prajapat, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
41. Pappu Devi W/o Nainaram Prajapat, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
42. Ruparam S/o Sukharam Prajapat, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
43. Somraj S/o Allaram Prajapat, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
44. Bhanwarlal S/o Kishnaram Prajapat, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
45. Gorakharam S/o Papuram Prajapat, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
46. Babudevi W/o Papuram Prajapat, Aged About 22 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
47. Geeta Devi W/o Allaram Prajapat, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
48. Suresh S/o Gopilal Bishnoi, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
49. Magaram S/o Aaidanram Prajapat, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
50. Naresh S/o Aaidan Ram Prajapat, Aged About 19 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
51. Guddi Devi W/o Kapil Dev Darji, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

52. Chukidevi W/o Somraj Prajapat, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
53. Satudevi W/o Gumanaram Prajapat, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
54. Manisha W/o Deepak Prajapat, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
55. Suman W/o Ganesh Prajapat, Aged About 22 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
56. Bhaganaram S/o Pappuram Prajapat, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
57. Bajarang S/o Ruparam Prajapat, Aged About 19 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
58. Chaini W/o Kishanram Prajapat, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
59. Kesharam S/o Ramuram Prajapat, Aged About 43 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
60. Sunil S/o Kapildev Darji, Aged About 18 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
61. Ramniwas S/o Gopilal Bishnoi, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
62. Bhajanlal S/o Balutaram Bishnoi, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
63. Manohar S/o Hariram Prajapat, Aged About 19 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
64. Samudevi W/o Dhanaram Prajapat, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

65. Gopidevi W/o Omprakash Prajapat, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
66. Nirmadevi W/o Mukesh Prajapat, Aged About 21 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
67. Sanju Devi W/o Kailash Prajapat, Aged About 22 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
68. Parwati Devi W/o Shankarlal Darji, Aged About 82 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
69. Papudevi W/o Manaram Prajapat, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
70. Papuram S/o Sukharam Prajapat, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
71. Hastudevi W/o Somraj Prajapat, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
72. Gorakhram S/o Papuram Prajapat, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
73. Manishadevi W/o Gorakhram Prajapat, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
74. Bhanwaridevi W/o Champalal Prajapat, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
75. Jethidevi W/o Sukharam Prajapat, Aged About 90 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
76. Hadmanaram S/o Champalal Prajapat, Aged About 21 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
77. Jyoti W/o Magaram Prajapat, Aged About 21 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

78. Ompalsingh S/o Ranjeet Singh Rajput, Aged About 22 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
79. Ranusingh S/o Indrasingh Rajput, Aged About 59 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
80. Vikram Singh S/o Ranjeet Singh, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
81. Moolsingh S/o Bhomsingh Rajput, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
82. Kushalkanwar W/o Ranjeet Singh, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
83. Harisingh S/o Indrasingh Rajput, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
84. Rewat Singh S/o Indrasingh Rajput, Aged About 64 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
85. Karansingh S/o Rewat Singh Rajput, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
86. Gudi @ Champakanwar W/o Rewatsingh, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
87. Balutaram S/o Kanuram Bishnoi, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
88. Jyoti W/o Bhajnaram Bishnoi, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
89. Chamnti W/o Balutaram Bishnoi, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
90. Hariram Prajapat S/o Chunaram, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

91. Durgaram Prajapat S/o Chunaram, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
92. Ramadevi Prajapat W/o Durgaram, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
93. Punaram Prajapat S/o Chunaram, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
94. Santu Devi Prajapat W/o Punaram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Revenue Department, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayatiraj And Rural Development Department, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Phalodi.
4. Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Division Bapini, District Phalodi.
5. Tehsildar, Bapini, District Phalodi.
6. Smt. Purankanwar, The Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Matora, Panchayat Samiti Bapini, District Phalodi.
7. Kishan Dan Chaan, Gram Vikash Adhikari, Gram Panchayat Matora, Panchayat Samiti Bapini, District Phalodi.

-----Respondents

Connected With

(2) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9604/2022

1. Rajendra Prasad Ahari S/o Sh. Vidhyasagar Ahari, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Village Bhaua Kamlimata Fala, Tehsil Rishabhdev, District Udaipur (Raj.).
2. Laxmilal Meena S/o Sh. Kanji Meena, Aged About 77 Years, R/o Village Bhaua Kamlimata Fala, Tehsil Rishabhdev, District Udaipur (Raj.).
3. Satyendra Kumar Meena S/o Sh. Nathu Ji, Aged About 68 Years, R/o Village Bhaua Kamlimata Fala, Tehsil

Rishabhdev, District Udaipur (Raj.).

4. Motilal Meena S/o Sh. Dhula Ji, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Bhaua Kamlimata Fala, Tehsil Rishabhdev, District Udaipur (Raj.).
5. Manish Kumar Meena S/o Sh. Laxman Lal, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Bhaua Kamlimata Fala, Tehsil Rishabhdev, District Udaipur (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. The Local Self Department, Government Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan Through Principal Secretary, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector, Udaipur.
5. The Gram Panchayat Rishabhdev, Udaipur Through Its Sarpanch

-----Respondents

(3) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2053/2024

1. Vinod Kumar Meena S/o Chatra Ram Meena, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Bandla, Tehsil - Kherwada, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Rajendra Kumar Meena S/o Jeeva, Aged About 43 Years, Resident Of Jhusawara, Bandal, Tehsil - Kherwada, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
3. Krishan Kumar S/o Megha, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Mothli, Tehsil - Kherwada, Udaipur, Rajasthan.
4. Ramesh Chandra Meena S/o Nagji, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of Mothli, Badla, Tehsil - Kherwada, Udaipur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Local Self Department, G-3, Rajmahal Residential Area, C- Scheme, Near Civil Line Crossing, Jaipur - 302016.

2. Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Director Cum Speical Secretary, Local Self Department, G-3, Rajmahal Residential Area, Near Civil Line Crossing, Jaipur - 302016.
4. District Collector, Udaipur.

----Respondents

(4) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7749/2024

1. Jayanti Lal Meena S/o Dhanraj Meena, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Shikarbari, Ward No. - 06, Dhariawad, District - Pratapgarh, (Rajasthan).
2. Laxman Lal Meena S/o Raman Lal Meena, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Shikarbari, Ward No. - 06, Dhariawad, District - Pratapgarh, (Rajasthan).

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Rajasthan).
2. Department Of Local Self Government, Through Director And Joint Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Rajasthan).
3. District Collector Pratapgarh, Office Of District Collector And District Magistrate, Pratapgarh (Rajasthan).
4. Sub Division Officer Dhariawad, Office Of Sub Division Officer And Sub Division Magistrate, Dhariawad, District - Pratapgarh (Rajasthan).
5. Municipal Board, Dhariawad, Through Its Executive Officer (Tehsildar Dhariawad), District - Pratapgarh (Rajasthan).
6. Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayat Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Rajasthan).

----Respondents

(5) D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 831/2025

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Revenue Department, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayati Raj And Rural

Development Department, Jaipur.

3. District Collector, Phalodi.
4. Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Division Bapini, District Phalodi.
5. Tehsildar, Bapini, District Phalodi.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. Dhannaram S/o Chunaram Prajapat, Aged About 57 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
2. Bhomsingh, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
3. Punamchand S/o Badrinarayan Darji, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
4. Kapildev S/o Badrinarayan Darji, Aged About 41 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
5. Taruna W/o Punama Chand Darji, Aged About 43 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
6. Ganesh S/o Nathuram Prajapat, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
7. Govindram S/o Nathuram Prajapat, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
8. Amra Ram S/o Kojaram Bishnoi, Aged About 67 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
9. Hariram S/o Kojaram Bishnoi, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
10. Somraj S/o Kishnaram Bishnoi, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
11. Nainaram S/o Ramuram Prajapat, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini,

District Phalodi.

12. Aaidanram S/o Ramuram Prajapat, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
13. Kishnaram S/o Sukharam Prajapat, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
14. Kasumbi W/o Chunaram Prajapat, Aged About 73 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
15. Om Prakash S/o Dannaram Prajapat, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
16. Mukesh S/o Dhannaram Prajapat, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
17. Champalal S/o Chunaram Prajapat, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
18. Kailash S/o Dhannaram Prajapat, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
19. Dhani Devi W/o Nathuram Prajapat, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
20. Rajuram S/o Kanaram Bishnoi, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
21. Budharam S/o Kanaram Bishnoi, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
22. Sarita W/o Manak Bishnoi, Aged About 20 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
23. Mohini W/o Kishnaram Bishnoi, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
24. Sidharam S/o Himataram Jat, Aged About 75 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini,

District Phalodi.

25. Gainaram S/o Sidararam Jat, Aged About 41 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
26. Harku W/o Sidararam Jat, Aged About 74 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
27. Samu W/o Gainaram Jat, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
28. Amararam S/o Sidararam Jat, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
29. Prahalad S/o Aamraram Jat, Aged About 20 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
30. Sunil S/o Aamraram Jat, Aged About 19 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
31. Prem S/o Aamraram Jat, Aged About 18 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
32. Meera W/o Aamraram Jat, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
33. Ravisankar S/o Bhomaram Jat, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
34. Bhanwaridevi W/o Bhomaram Jat, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
35. Alaram S/o Sukharam Prajapat, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
36. Geeta W/o Alaram Prajapat, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
37. Manaram S/o Alaram Prajapat, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini,

District Phalodi.

38. Dhatu W/o Govindram Prajapat, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
39. Bhanwari Devi W/o Aaidanram Prajapat, Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
40. Magi Devi W/o Kesharam Prajapat, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
41. Pappu Devi W/o Nainaram Prapajat, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
42. Ruparam S/o Sukharam Prajapat, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
43. Somraj S/o Allaram Prajapat, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
44. Bhanwarlal S/o Kishnaram Prajapat, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
45. Gorakharam S/o Papuram Prajapat, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
46. Babudevi W/o Papuram Prajapat, Aged About 22 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
47. Geeta Devi W/o Allaram Prajapat, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
48. Suresh S/o Gopilal Bishnoi, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
49. Magaram S/o Aaidanram Prajapat, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
50. Naresh S/o Aaidan Ram Prajapat, Aged About 19 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini,

District Phalodi.

51. Guddi Devi W/o Kapil Dev Darji, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
52. Chukidevi W/o Somraj Prajapat, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
53. Satudevi W/o Gumanaram Prajapat, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
54. Manisha W/o Deepak Prajapat, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
55. Suman W/o Ganesh Prajapat, Aged About 22 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
56. Bhaganaram S/o Pappuram Prajapat, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
57. Bajarang S/o Ruparam Prajapat, Aged About 19 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
58. Chaini W/o Kishanram Prajapat, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
59. Kesharam S/o Ramuram Prajapat, Aged About 43 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
60. Sunil S/o Kapildev Darji, Aged About 18 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
61. Ramniwas S/o Gopilal Bishnoi, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
62. Bhajanlal S/o Balutaram Bishnoi, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
63. Manohar S/o Hariram Prajapat, Aged About 19 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini,

District Phalodi.

64. Samudevi W/o Dhanarm Prajapat, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
65. Gopidevi W/o Omprakash Prajapat, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
66. Nirmadevi W/o Mukesh Prajapat, Aged About 21 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
67. Sanju Devi W/o Kailash Prajapat, Aged About 22 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
68. Parwati Dev W/o Shankarlal Darji, Aged About 82 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
69. Papudevi W/o Manaram Prajapat, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
70. Papuram S/o Sukharam Prajapat, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
71. Hastudevi S/o Somraj Prajapat, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
72. Gorakhram S/o Papuram Prajapat, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
73. Manishadevi W/o Gorakhram Prajapat, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
74. Bhanwaridevi W/o Champalal Prajapat, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
75. Jethidevi W/o Sukharam Prajapat, Aged About 90 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
76. Hadmanaram S/o Champalal Prajapat, Aged About 21 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil

Bapini, District Phalodi.

77. Jyoti W/o Magaram Prajapat, Aged About 21 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
78. Ompalsingh S/o Ranjeet Singh Rajput, Aged About 22 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
79. Ranusingh S/o Indrasingh Rajput, Aged About 59 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
80. Vikram Singh S/o Ranjeet Singh, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
81. Moolsingh S/o Bho0Msingh Rajput, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
82. Kushalkanwar W/o Ranjeet Singh, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
83. Harisingh S/o Indrasingh Rajput, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
84. Rewat Singh S/o Indrasingh Rajput, Aged About 64 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
85. Karansingh S/o Rewat Singh Rajput, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
86. Gudi @ Champakanwar W/o Rewatsingh, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
87. Balutaram S/o Kanaram Bishnoi, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
88. Jyoti W/o Bhajnaram Bishnoi, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
89. Chamnti W/o Balutaram Bishnoi, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini,

District Phalodi.

90. Hariram Prajapati S/o Chunaram, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
91. Durgaram Prajapati S/o Chunaram, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
92. Ramadevi Prajapati W/o Durgaram, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
93. Punaram Prajapat S/o Chunaram, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
94. Santu Devi Prajapat W/o Punaram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Shivnagar, Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
95. Smt. Purankanwar, The Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Matora, Panchayat Samiti Bapini, District Phalodi.
96. Kishan Dan Charan, Gram Vikash Adhikari, Gram Panchayat Matora, Panchayat Samiti Bapini, District Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(6) D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1005/2025

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Local Self Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector, Rajsamand, Rajasthan.
3. The Director Cum Special Secretary, Local Self Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. The Executive Officer, Municipal Board Devgarh, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. Narayan Singh Solanki S/o Shri Ganpat Singh Solanki, Aged About 82 Years, Kesharing Ghati Ward No. 12, Devgarh, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.
2. Rizwan Faruk Lodi S/o Shri Gani Mohammed, Aged

About 59 Years, R/o Of 21, Bapu Nagar, Near Pani Ki Tanki, Devgarh, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.

3. Hansraj Kansara S/o Shri Mohan Lal Kansara, Aged About 54 Years, R/o Of Suraj Darwaja, Ward No. 13, Devgarh, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.
4. Firoz Mohammed Lodi S/o Shri Gaffor Mohammed Lodi, Aged About 54 Years, R/o Naya Darwaja Bapu Nagar, Devgarh, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.
5. Faruq Mohammed Chippa S/o Shri Farid Mohammed Chippa, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Vedwari Darwaja, Ballo Ki Pol, Devgarh, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.
6. Prakash Chandra S/o Shri Krishan Chandra, Aged About 74 Years, R/o Ward No. 20, Devgarh, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(7) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 2148/2025

1. Rajasthan Panchayat Samiti Sadsya Sangh, Through Its President Rajendra Singh Shekhawat S/o Manohar Singh Shekhawat, Aged 43 Years, Resident Of Shri Ram Nagar Extension, Aged 43 Years, Resident Of Shri Ram Nagar Extension, 18 Ganpati Nagar, Jaipur.
2. Mahesh Kumar Yadav S/o Chauthmal Yadav, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 14, Bakasala Ki Dhani, Samod, Jaipur.
3. Suresh Chand Gurjar S/o Dana Ram, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Sitarampura, Mamana, Jaipur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Village Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Dy. Secretary, Village Development And Panchayati Raj, Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

-----Respondents

(8) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7959/2025

Bhanwar Lal Bhayal S/o Natharam Bhyala, Aged About 57 Years, R/o 21, Choudhariyo Ka Baas, Risaniya, District Pali, Rajasthan.



-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of The Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Pali.
3. Tehsildar, Marwar Junction, District Pali.
4. Vikash Adhikari, Panchayat Samiti Marwar - Junction, District Pali.

-----Respondents

(9) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8040/2025

1. Narayan Singh Solanki S/o Shri Ganpat Singh Solanki, Aged About 82 Years, Resident Of Kesharing Ghati Ward No. 12, Devgarh, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.
2. Rizwan Faruk Lodi S/o Shri Gani Mohammed Lodi, Aged About 59 Years, Resident Of 21, Bapu Nagar, Near Pani Ki Tanki, Devgarh, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.
3. Hansraj Kansara S/o Shri Mohan Lal Kansara, Aged About 54 Years, Resident Of Suraj Darwaja Ward No. 13, Devgarh, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.
4. Firoz Mohammed Lodi S/o Shri Gaffor Mohammed Lodi, Aged About 54 Years, Resident Of Naya Darwaja Bapu Nagar, Devgarh, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.
5. Faruq Mohammed Chippa S/o Shri Farid Mohammed Chippa, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Vedwari Darwaja, Ballo Ki Pol, Devgarh, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.
6. Prakash Chandra S/o Shri Krishan Chandra, Aged About 74 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 20, Devgarh, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Local Self Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector, Rajsamand, Rajasthan.
3. The Director Cum Special Secretary, Local Self Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

4. The Executive Officer, Municipal Board Devgarh, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(10) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8167/2025


1. Kojaram S/o Moolaram Saran, Aged About 64 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
2. Rakesh S/o Deeparam Saran, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
3. Jalaram S/o Gorakhram Saran, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
4. Achlaram S/o Baburam Saran, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
5. Rughnathram S/o Baburam Saran, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
6. Omaram S/o Jiyaram Saran, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
7. Gumanaram S/o Baburam Saran, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
8. Pappu S/o Jalaram Saran, Aged About 30 Years, Village R/o Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
9. Rukhi W/o Gumanaram Saran, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
10. Laxmi W/o Achlaram Saran, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
11. Pappu S/o Rughnathram Saran, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
12. Maadu W/o Jiyaram Saran, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post

Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

13. Baburam S/o Ranaram Saran, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
14. Bansilal S/o Baburam Saran, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
15. Dinesh S/o Bansilal Saran, Aged About 18 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
16. Sunil Kumar Saran S/o Bansilal Saran, Aged About 16 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
17. Usha W/o Umaidaram Prajapat, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
18. Hiraram S/o Gorakhram Saran, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
19. Deeparam S/o Chimaram Saran, Aged About 56 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
20. Om Prakash S/o Deeparam Saran, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
21. Bhomaram S/o Deeparam Saran, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
22. Kishni W/o Deeparam Saran, Aged About 58 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
23. Santosh S/o Om Prakash Saran, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
24. Sukhi W/o Bhomaram Saran, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
25. Bheraram S/o Haruram Saran, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post


Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

26. Premi W/o Bheraram Saran, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
27. Ratanaram S/o Bheraram Saran, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
28. Amritram S/o Hadmanaram Saran, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
29. Mangilal S/o Hadmanaram Saran, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
30. Kamla W/o Mangilal Saran, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
31. Champa W/o Hadmanaram Saran, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
32. Ashi W/o Jetharam Saran, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
33. Achlaram S/o Hadmanaram Saran, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
34. Dinesh Kumar S/o Devaram Saran, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
35. Ashi W/o Devaram Saran, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
36. Narshingharam S/o Chiparam Saran, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
37. Suha S/o Narsingharam Saran, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
38. Ramesh S/o Nasirgharam Saran, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post




Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

39. Bhanwarlal S/o Chunaram Saran, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
40. Barajudevi W/o Bhanwarlal Saran, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
41. Chunaram S/o Amaram Saran, Aged About 70 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
42. Gumani W/o Chunaram Saran, Aged About 67 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
43. Kojaram S/o Moolaram Saran, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
44. Samdu S/o Kojaram Saran, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
45. Bhagirathram S/o Ugmaram Saran, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
46. Pura S/o Hadmanaram Saran, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
47. Ugmaram S/o Amaram Saran, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
48. Gomati W/o Ugmaram Saran, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
49. Manish S/o Ugaram Saran, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
50. Kishanram S/o Amaram Saran, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
51. Bhikaram S/o Shri Kishnaram Saran, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev




- Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
52. Mangilal S/o Shri Kisnaram Saran, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 53. Noji W/o Shri Kishnaram Saran, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 54. Navalaram S/o Shri Amaram Saran, Aged About 70 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 55. Aashi W/o Shri Navalaram Saran, Aged About 68 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 56. Tilaram S/o Shri Navalaram Saran, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 57. Omi W/o Shri Tilaram Saran, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 58. Kesharam S/o Shri Amaram Saran, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 59. Panni W/o Shri Kesharam Saran, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 60. Aaduram S/o Shri Kesharam Saran, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 61. Pappudevi W/o Shri Aaduram Saran, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 62. Likhmaram S/o Shri Kesharm Saran, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 63. Gudhi W/o Shri Likhmaram Saran, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 64. Shamu W/o Shri Ramuram Saran, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post




Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

65. Chandani W/o Shri Lalaram Saran, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
66. Hawa W/o Shri Sonaram Saran, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
67. Lila W/o Shri Mangilal Saran, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
68. Sohanram S/o Shri Lalaram Saran, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
69. Pemaram S/o Shri Punaram Saran, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
70. Beera W/o Shri Pemaram Saran, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
71. Ashi W/o Shri Punaram Saran, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
72. Papuram S/o Shri Pemaram Saran, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
73. Sonaram S/o Shri Bagtaram Saran, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
74. Dugarram S/o Shri Kishnaram Saran, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
75. Sohanram S/o Shri Kishnaram Saran, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
76. Genaram S/o Shri Kishnaram Saran, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
77. Kishnaram S/o Shri Mularm Saran, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev




- Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
78. Santoshram S/o Shri Phoosarm Saran, Aged About 17 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 79. Dhapu Devi W/o Shri Kishnaram Saran, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 80. Hemi Devi W/o Shri Sonaram Saran, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 81. Jhamu Devi W/o Shri Mohanram Saran, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 82. Ashi W/o Shri Ashuram Saran, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 83. Mohanram S/o Shri Bagataram Saran, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 84. Ashuram S/o Shri Bagataram Saran, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 85. Ganga Devi W/o Shri Bagataram Saran, Aged About 80 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 86. Swarooparam S/o Shri Sonaram Saran, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 87. Chokharam S/o Shri Jetharam Saran, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 88. Kesi Devi W/o Shri Chokharam Saran, Aged About 54 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 89. Phoosaram W/o Shri Mularam Saran, Aged About 58 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 90. Shivrinar S/o Shri Phoosaram Saran, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post




Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

91. Mira Devi W/o Shri Phoosaram Saran, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
92. Hadmanaram S/o Shri Mularam Saran, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
93. Jogaram S/o Shri Hadmanaram Saran, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
94. Devaram S/o Shri Kojaram Saran, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
95. Likhmaram S/o Shri Kojaram Saran, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
96. Papuram S/o Shri Kishnaram Saran, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
97. Ruparam S/o Shri Kishnaram Saran, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
98. Sungni W/o Shri Ruparam Saran, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
99. Heera W/o Shri Mangilal Saran, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
100. Bermaram S/o Shri Kishnaram Saran, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
101. Sushila W/o Shri Papuram Saran, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
102. Lila W/o Shri Shaitanram Saran, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
103. Shaitanram S/o Shri Deeparam Saran, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.




Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

104. Kanaram S/o Shri Kojaram Saran, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
105. Samu Devi W/o Shri Kanaram Saran, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
106. Lalaram S/o Shri Purkharam Saran, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
107. Aidanram S/o Shri Jetharam Saran, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
108. Banshilal S/o Shri Kunaram Prajapat, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
109. Gomadram S/o Shri Achlaram Prajapat, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
110. Suresh S/o Shri Achlaram Prajapat, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
111. Achlaram S/o Shri Jetharam Prajapat, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
112. Lila W/o Shri Devaram Prajapat, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
113. Chandu W/o Shri Tulcharam Prajapat, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
114. Pampi W/o Shri Achlaram Prajapat, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
115. Sohni W/o Shri Pratapram Saran, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
116. Vishnu W/o Shri Gomadram Prajapat, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev




Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

117. Tulchi W/o Shri Gorkharam Saran, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
118. Sharda W/o Shri Banshilal Prajapat, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
119. Lachha W/o Shri Beeramaram Prajapat, Aged About 20 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
120. Beeramaram S/o Shri Kunaram Prajapat, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
121. Kunaram S/o Shri Jodharam Prajapat, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
122. Jhamku W/o Shri Kunaram Prajapat, Aged About 58 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
123. Papu Devi W/o Shri Pokarram Beldar, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
124. Bhomaram S/o Shri Bhagaram Beldar, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
125. Dhariyav W/o Shri Achlaram Beldar, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
126. Tulcharam W/o Shri Bhagaram Beldar, Aged About 49 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
127. Kamla W/o Shri Tulcharam Beldar, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
128. Mumaram S/o Shri Bhuraram Beldar, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
129. Govandi Devi W/o Shri Mumaram Beldar, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Shivrinar (Purposed Mahadev




Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

130. Dariyav W/o Shri Bhuraram Beldar, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
131. Magaram S/o Shri Bhagaram Beldar, Aged About 51 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
132. Om Prakash S/o Shri Bhuraram Beldar, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
133. Sushila S/o Shri Om Prakash Beldar, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
134. Ramsheeri W/o Shri Magaram Beldar, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
135. Harlalram S/o Shri Bhuraram Beldar, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
136. Sharunram S/o Shri Bhuraram Beldar, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
137. Dhanaram S/o Shri Bhuraram Beldar, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
138. Ramdeen S/o Shri Tulcharam Beldar, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
139. Manju Devi W/o Shri Dhanaram Beldar, Aged About 19 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
140. Surta W/o Shri Sharunram Beldar, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
141. Neembu Devi W/o Shri Harlalram Beldar, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
142. Pokarram S/o Shri Bheraram Beldar, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev



Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

143. Achlaram S/o Shri Bheraram Beldar, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
144. Naktu Devi W/o Shri Bhagaram Beldar, Aged About 80 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
145. Bheraram S/o Shri Bhekham Beldar, Aged About 78 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
146. Dungram S/o Shri Bheraram Beldar, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
147. Ramdayal S/o Shri Bheraram Beldar, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
148. Kamla W/o Shri Dugram Beldar, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
149. Manoharlal S/o Shri Rugnath Ram Bishnoi, Aged About 66 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
150. Sayari Devi W/o Shri Manoharlal Bishnoi, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
151. Sharwan S/o Shri Manoharlal Bishnoi, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
152. Mangilal S/o Shri Manoharlal Bishnoi, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
153. Pancharam S/o Shri Manoharlal Bishnoi, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
154. Jasoda W/o Shri Dinesh Kumar Bishnoi, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
155. Shyamlal S/o Shri Tulcharam Beldar, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev



Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

156. Baburam S/o Shri Udaram Beldar, Aged About 70 Years, R/o Village Shivnagar (Purposed Mahadev Nagar), Post Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Revenue Department, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayatiraj And Rural Development Department, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Phalodi.
4. Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Division Bapini, District Phalodi.
5. Tehsildar, Bapini, District Phalodi.
6. Smt. Purankanwar, The Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Matora, Panchayat Samiti Bapini, District Phalodi.
7. Kishan Dan Charan, Gram Vikash Adhikari, Gram Panchayat Matora, Panchayat Samiti Bapini, District Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(11) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8534/2025

Gopi S/o Shri Magna Ram, Aged About 59 Years, Resident Of Janiyo Ki Dahniya, Sodala, Achlawati, Lodata, Achanwata, District Jodhpur (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jodhpur.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(12) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8535/2025

1. Oma Ram S/o Shri Kana Ram, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Godelai, Tehsil Balesar, District Jodhpur (Raj.)



2. Babu Ram S/o Shri Girdhari Ram, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Godelai, Tehsil Balesar, District Jodhpur (Raj.)
3. Raju Ram S/o Shri Ravat Ram, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Godelai, Tehsil Balesar, District Jodhpur (Raj.)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jodhpur
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Jodhpur.

-----Respondents


(13) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8645/2025

1. Kewal Ram S/o Shri Gorakh Ram, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Judiya Tehsil Balesar District Jodhpur.
2. Ummeda Ram S/o Shri Poona Ram, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village Judiya Tehsil Balesar District Jodhpur.
3. Dola Ram S/o Shri Deda Ram, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Village Judiya Tehsil Balesar District Jodhpur.
4. Mahipal Singh S/o Shri Mool Dan, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village Judiya Tehsil Balesar District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Revenue (Gr.ii), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Dy. Secretary, Department Of Revenue (Gr.i), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. Board Of Revenue, Rajasthan, Ajmer, Through Registrar.
5. The District Collector, Jodhpur.
6. Gram Panchayat Judiya, Panchayat Samiti Balesar



District Jodhpur Through Its Village Development Officer.

7. Tehsildar (Revenue), Balesar, District Jodhpur.
8. Sub Divisional Officer, Balesar, District Jodhpur.
9. Patwari, Patwar Mandal Judiya District Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(14) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8698/2025

1. Sahdev Singh Bhati S/o Shri Bhanwar Singh Bhati, Aged About 43 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 4, Taranagar Tehsil Taranagar District Churu. Presently Ward Member, Ward No. 4, Municipal Board, Taranagar District Churu.
2. Yakub Khan S/o Shri Bajir Khan, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 31, Taranagar Tehsil Taranagar District Churu. Presently Ward Member, Ward No. 31, Municipal Board, Taranagar District Churu.
3. Bilal Ahmed S/o Shri Safi Mohammed, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 14, Taranagar Tehsil Taranagar District Churu. Presently Ward Member, Ward No. 14, Municipal Board, Taranagar District Churu.
4. Priyanka Bano W/o Shri Usman Khan, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 32, Taranagar Tehsil Taranagar District Churu. At Present Chairman, Municipal Board, Taranagar District Churu.
5. Hari Singh S/o Shri Manphool Singh Beniwal, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 26, Taranagar Tehsil Taranagar District Churu. At Present Ward Member, Ward No. 26, Municipal Board, Taranagar District Churu.
6. Munshi Khan S/o Shri Abdulla, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 32, Taranagar Tehsil Taranagar District Churu.
7. Safi Mohammed S/o Shri Chiragdeen, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 14, Taranagar Tehsil Taranagar District Churu.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Local Self, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.



2. Director Cum Special Secretary, Department Of Local Bodies, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. State Election Commission Rajasthan, Jaipur, Through Secretary.
4. District Election Officer Cum District Collector, Churu.
5. Municipal Board, Taranagar, District Churu Through Its Executive Officer.
6. Sub Divisional Officer, Taranagar, District Churu.
7. Rakesh Jangid S/o Budha Ram, (Ex-Candidate Of Mla, Bjp, Vidhan Sabha Taranagar), Resident Of Ward No. 3, Taranagar, District Churu.

-----Respondents

(15) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8748/2025

1. Deva Ram S/o Shri Tulchha Ram, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Vill. Panotari Nadi, Gram Panchayat Bhakhri Kheda, Dist. Balotra.
2. Bhanwar Lal S/o Shri Achalaram, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Vill. Bhakri Kheda, Dist. Balotra.

-----Petitioners

Versus

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

-----Respondents

(16) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8772/2025

Mohan Lal Godara S/o Bhinya Ram Ji, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village Pandav Nagar, Post Daboi, Tehsil Dhorimana, Dist. Barmer.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Revenue Department (Group-1), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The District Collector, Barmer.
3. The Sub Division Officer, Dhorimana, Dist. Barmer.

-----Respondents



(17) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8858/2025

1. Imam S/o Akalu, Aged About 51 Years, Rahuma Azim Ki Basti, Tehsil Dhanau, District Barmer (Raj.)
2. Rehamtulla S/o Mohammad, Aged About 52 Years, Sadaniya Ka Bas, Rahuma Azim Ki Basti, Tehsil Dhanau, District Barmer (Raj.)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Chohtan, District Barmer
4. Tehsildar Dhanau, District Barmer
5. Patwari Binjasar, Tehsil Dhanau, District Barmer

-----Respondents

(18) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8882/2025

1. Kanwara Ram S/o Chutra Ram, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Nakoda, Tehsil Sindhari, District Balotra (Raj.).
2. Jala Ram S/o Ganga Ram, Aged About 74 Years, Resident Of Lohida, District Balotra (Raj.).
3. Bhanwara Ram S/o Bhana Ram, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of Nakoda, Lohida, Tehsil Sindhari, District Balotra (Raj.).
4. Mal Singh S/o Deep Singh, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Nakoda, District Balotra (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Joint Secretary, Department Of Revenue (Group-1), Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. The Registrar, Board Of Revenue, Rajasthan, Ajmer.



5. The Deputy Registrar, Board Of Revenue, Rajasthan, Ajmer.
6. The District Collector, Balotra.
7. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sindhari, District Balotra.
8. The Tehsildar, Sindhari, District Balotra.

-----Respondents

(19) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8913/2025

1. Junja Ram S/o Rupa Ram, Aged About 55 Years, Ratanada, Tehsil Sindhari, District Balotra (Raj.).
2. Bhura Ram S/o Mala Ram, Aged About 50 Years, Ratanada, District Balotra (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary And Commissioner, Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector, Balotra.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sindhari, District Balotra.
6. The Tehsildar, Sindhari, District Balotra.

-----Respondents


(20) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8917/2025

1. Uma Ram S/o Shri Kharta Ram, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of Adarsh Lohida, Tehsil Sindhari, District Balotra (Raj.).
2. Shembhu Ram S/o Shri Ruga Ram, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Adarsh Lohida, District Balotra (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary And Commissioner, Panchayati Raj



Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.

3. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector, Balotra.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sindhari, District Balotra.
6. The Tehsildar, Sindhari, District Balotra.

-----Respondents

(21) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8918/2025

Gram Panchayat, Radod, Panchayat Samiti Bhopalgarh, District Jodhpur, Through Its Sarpanch, Manju Devi W/o Gajendra, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village Pango Ka Bas, Radod, Tehsil Bhopalgarh, District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioner


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Secretary To The Govt. And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur
3. District Collector, Jodhpur.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Bhopalgarh, District Jodhpur
5. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Bhopalgarh, District Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(22) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8923/2025

1. Nakhat Singh S/o Sh. Bhanwar Singh, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Girab, District Barmer (Raj.).
2. Virendra Singh S/o Sh. Khuman Singh, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Girab, District Barmer (Raj.).
3. Shetan Singh S/o Sh. Chandan Singh, Aged About 49 Years, Resident Of Girab, District Barmer (Raj.).
4. Pancharaj Singh S/o Sh. Shiv Singh, Aged About 74 Years, Resident Of Village Taliya, Girab, District Barmer (Raj.).



5. Gemara Ram S/o Sh. Manji, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Girab, District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Special Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through Deputy Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Barmer.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Gadra Road, Barmer (Raj.).
5. Tehsildar, Gadra Road, Barmer (Raj.).
6. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Gadra Road, District Barmer (Raj.).


-----Respondents

(23) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 8980/2025

1. Shaitanaram Paladiya Bishnoi S/o Shri Malaram, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
2. Bharmalram Manjhu Bishnoi S/o Shri Ramkishan, Aged About 68 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
3. Ramlal Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Fataram, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
4. Jairamram Khileri S/o Shri Narshingharam, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
5. Chainaram Paldiya Bishnoi S/o Shri Amalakaram, Aged About 68 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
6. Hanumanaram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Birbalram, Aged




- About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
7. Hadmanaram Paladiya Bishnoi S/o Shri Balvantaram, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 8. Hadmanaram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Savtaram, Aged About 68 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 9. Om Prakash Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Surajanram, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 10. Balaram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Surjanram, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 11. Malaram Paladiya Bishnoi S/o Shri Fagaluram, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 12. Jagadishram Godara Bishnoi S/o Shri Khetaram, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 13. Ashok Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Hadmanaram, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 14. Heeraram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Birbalram, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 15. Kaluram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Birbalram, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 16. Ratanaram Manju Bishnoi S/o Shri Fagaturam, Aged



About 58 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.


17. Sukhram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Narshingharam, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
18. Ramlalram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Narshingharam, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
19. Heeraram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Ramlalram, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
20. Jeevanram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Narshingharam, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
21. Harlalram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Khiyaram, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
22. Jagdish Prashad Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Ramlal, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
23. Suresh Kumar Manju Bishnoi S/o Shri Om Prakash, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
24. Anil Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Hiraram, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
25. Jagdish Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Jeevanram, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
26. Bhanwarlal Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Sukhram, Aged



- About 50 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
27. Chandaram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Goparam, Aged About 41 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 28. Prataparam Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Dhannaram, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 29. Baburam Manjhu Bishnoi S/o Shri Jairam, Aged About 64 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 30. Ramnarayan Paladiya Bishnoi S/o Shri Harchadaram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 31. Heeradevi Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Surjanram, Aged About 66 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 32. Sayari Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Balaram, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 33. Maina Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Manoj, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 34. Pushpa Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Mahipal, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 35. Pooja Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Shishpal, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 36. Pappuram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Sukhram, Aged About




- 55 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
37. Tejaram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Sukhram, Aged About 64 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
38. Patashi Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Tejaram, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
39. Ashok Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Tejaram, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
40. Sarita Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Pappuram, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
41. Rami Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Sukhram, Aged About 67 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
42. Nirama Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Ashok, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
43. Saitanaram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Arjunram, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
44. Kanwarlal Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Arjunram, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
45. Baby Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Kishanaram, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
46. Sumta Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Shaitanaram, Aged




About 30 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

47. Santi Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Kanwarlal, Aged About 67 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
48. Sangita Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Kanwarlal, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
49. Sonidevi Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Dhannaram, Aged About 72 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
50. Gera Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Ramlal, Aged About 68 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
51. Sumta Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Punaram, Aged About 43 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
52. Pappudevi Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Joraram, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
53. Bhagwanaram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Ramlal, Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
54. Samla Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Malaram, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
55. Hadmanaram Bagadwa Bishnoi S/o Shri Harchandram, Aged About 47 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
56. Parmeshwari Bagadwa Bishnoi W/o Shri Hadmanaram,



Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

57. Harchandram Bagadwa Bishnoi S/o Shri Khiyaram, Aged About 80 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
58. Sayri Bagadwa Bishnoi W/o Shri Kishnaram, Aged About 51 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
59. Bhagirayaram Bagadwa Bishnoi S/o Shri Birbalram, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
60. Lachi Bagadwa Bishnoi W/o Shri Birbalram, Aged About 67 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
61. Kailash Bagadwa Bishnoi S/o Shri Bagirath, Aged About 23 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
62. Bhuridevi Bagadwa Bishnoi W/o Shri Bhagirath, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
63. Ganpatram Bagadwa Bishnoi S/o Shri Birbalram, Aged About 54 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
64. Radha Bagadwa Bishnoi W/o Shri Ganpatram, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
65. Keli Manjhu Bishno W/o Shri Jagdishram, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
66. Budharam Manjhu Bishnoi S/o Shri Hadmanaram, Aged




About 58 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

67. Sohani Manjhu Bishnoi W/o Shri Budharam, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
68. Kherajram Jani Bishnoi W/o Shri Hadmanaram, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
69. Sita Manjhu Bishnoi W/o Shri Mohanram, Aged About 43 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
70. Dinesh Kumar Manju Bishnoi S/o Shri Budharam, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
71. Baburam Manjhu Bishnoi S/o Shri Ramlal, Aged About 59 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
72. Mangli Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Ramlal, Aged About 66 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
73. Sohani Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Baburam, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
74. Anil Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Hiraram, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
75. Parameshwari Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Heeraram, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
76. Heeraram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Ramlal, Aged About



- 60 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
77. Ramvivas Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Heeraram, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
78. Lichma Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Anil, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
79. Prakash Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Baburam, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
80. Bhanwarlal Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Goparam, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
81. Bidami Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Mohanram, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
82. Manish Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Mohanram, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
83. Hadmanaram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Harlalram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
84. Paalu Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Ganpataram, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
85. Krishn Kumar Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Sukhram, Aged About 57 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
86. Radha Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Krishn Kumar, Aged



- About 55 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
87. Sonidevi Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Sukhram, Aged About 64 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
88. Kishnaram Khichad Bishnoi S/o Shri Ramuram, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
89. Prakash Khichad Bishnoi S/o Shri Kishnaram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
90. Rukma Khichad Bishnoi Devi W/o Shri Kishnaram, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
91. Aichuki Bishnoi W/o Shri Prakash, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
92. Manoharlal Bagadwa Bishnoi S/o Shri Hanumanaram, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
93. Kaili Devi Manjhu Bishnoi W/o Shri Jagdish, Aged About 54 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
94. Kamla Manjhu Bishnoi W/o Shri Durgaram, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
95. Vasundhara Manjhu Bishnoi W/o Shri Shrawan, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
96. Shishpal Manjhu Bishnoi S/o Shri Bashilal, Aged About



- 38 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
97. Sita Manjhu Bishnoi W/o Shri Shishpal, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
98. Parvati Manjhu Bishnoi W/o Shri Banshilal, Aged About 66 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
99. Samda Manjhu Bishnoi W/o Shri Mahipal, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
100. Mahipal Manjhu Bishnoi S/o Shri Banshilal, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
101. Maganaram Godara Bishnoi S/o Shri Khiyaram, Aged About 54 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
102. Chanani Godara Bishnoi W/o Shri Maganaram, Aged About 51 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
103. Kamla Manjhu Bishnoi W/o Shri Om Prakash, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
104. Shishpal Manjhu Bishnoi S/o Shri Ratanaram, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
105. Rekha Manjhu Bishnoi W/o Shri Bhishpal, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
106. Pishta Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Om Prakash, Aged About



- 46 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
107. Pooja Khileri Bishnoi W/o Om Prakash, Aged About 20 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
108. Varsha Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Om Prakash, Aged About 22 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
109. Bhanwari Manjhu Bishnoi W/o Shri Ashok Kumar, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
110. Gomti Manjhu Bishnoi W/o Shri Baburam, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
111. Parameshwari Jani Bishnoi W/o Shri Bhanwarlal, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
112. Bharamalram Jani Bishnoi S/o Shri Harigaram, Aged About 64 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
113. Parmeshwari Jani Bishnoi W/o Shri Bharmalram, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
114. Sayari Jani Bishnoi W/o Shri Shrawan Kumar, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
115. Pacharam Jani Bishnoi S/o Shri Lichmanaram, Aged About 67 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
116. Hadmani Jani Bishnoi W/o Shri Pacharam, Aged About



65 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

117. Ram Sarup Jani Bishnoi S/o Shri Pancharam, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
118. Droupadi Jani Bishnoi W/o Shri Ram Sarup, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
119. Rajuram Jani Bishnoi S/o Shri Bharmalram, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
120. Geeta Jani Bishnoi W/o Shri Rajuram, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
121. Ram Narayan Manjhu Bishnoi S/o Shri Baburam, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
122. Siyama Manjhu Bishnoi W/o Shri Ram Narayan, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
123. Girdhariram Jani Bishnoi S/o Shri Harikishan, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
124. Manju Jani Bishnoi W/o Shri Girdhariram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
125. Mohanram Jani Bishnoi S/o Shri Amararam, Aged About 51 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
126. Rajkumari Jani Bishnoi W/o Shri Mohanram, Aged About



- 49 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
127. Narayanram Jani Bishnoi S/o Shri Amararam, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
128. Rekha Jani Bishnoi W/o Shri Narayanram, Aged About 54 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
129. Patashi Paladiya Bishnoi W/o Shri Saitanaram, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
130. Harikishan Jani Bishnoi S/o Shri Amararam, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
131. Dipi Jani Bishnoi W/o Shri Harikishan, Aged About 59 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
132. Babudi Paladiya Bishnoi W/o Shri Malaram, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
133. Rajuram Khichad Bishnoi S/o Shri Birabalram, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
134. Nirma Khichad Bishnoi W/o Shri Rajuram, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
135. Ashok Kumar Paladiya Bishnoi S/o Shri Chainaram, Aged About 49 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
136. Mohani Paladiya Bishnoi W/o Shri Sukhram, Aged About




- 62 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
137. Suresh Paladiya Bishnoi S/o Shri Sukhram, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
138. Radha Devi Paladiya Bishnoi W/o Shri Ashok Kumar, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
139. Lunga Paladiya Bishnoi W/o Shri Chainaram, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
140. Din Dayal Paladiya Bishnoi S/o Shri Danuram, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
141. Pushpa Paladiya Bishnoi W/o Shri Din Dayal, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
142. Hadmanaram Manjhu Bishnoi S/o Shri Jairam, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
143. Balwantaram Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Dhannaram, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
144. Jagdish Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Dhannaram, Aged About 49 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
145. Sumta Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Bhagwana, Aged About 22 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
146. Suni Bangdwa Bishnoi S/o Shri Kishnaram, Aged About



- 29 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
147. Nakhatsingh Rajput S/o Shri Chainsingh, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
148. Sukhram Jani Bishnoi S/o Shri Amraram, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
149. Pradeep Jani Bishnoi S/o Shri Sukhram, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
150. Sonaram Godara Jat S/o Shri Manakram, Aged About 64 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
151. Madu Godara Jat W/o Shri Sonaram, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
152. Padmaramk Godara Jat S/o Shri Sonaram, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
153. Bhuri Godara Jat W/o Shri Padmaram, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
154. Ramuram Godara Jat S/o Shri Beruram, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
155. Bhomaram Godara Jat S/o Shri Ramuram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
156. Dinesh Godara Jat S/o Shri Ramuram, Aged About 23



- Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
157. Puradevi Godara Jat W/o Shri Ramuram, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 158. Durgaram Godara Jat S/o Shri Beruram, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 159. Devi Godara Jat W/o Shri Durgaram, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 160. Manaram Godara Jat S/o Shri Umedaram, Aged About 66 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 161. Lichu Godara Jat W/o Shri Manaram, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 162. Dinesh Kumar Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Jagdish, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 163. Shishpal Jani Bishnoi S/o Shri Harikishan, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 164. Anil Jani Bishnoi S/o Shri Harikishan, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 165. Sua Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Jagdish, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
 166. Anopi Khileri Bishnoi W/o Shri Dinesh Kumar, Aged



About 28 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

167. Dinesh Kalirana Bishnoi S/o Shri Malaram, Aged About 24 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
168. Dhapu Jani Bishnoi W/o Shri Shishpal, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
169. Pemaram Godara Jat S/o Shri Beruram, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
170. Lalidevi Godara Jat W/o Shri Pemaram, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
171. Anoparam Godara Jat S/o Shri Pemaram, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
172. Mahendra Godara Jat S/o Shri Sonaran, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
173. Vinod Kumar Jani Bishnoi S/o Shri Sukhram, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
174. Teeja Devi Bangdwa Bishnoi W/o Shri Harchandram, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.
175. Somraj Khileri Bishnoi S/o Shri Bhanwarlal, Aged About 19 Years, Resident Of Village Matora (Newly Constructed Village Balaji Nagar), Gram Panchayat Matora, Tehsil Bapini, District Phalodi.

-----Petitioners



Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Revenue Department, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayatiraj And Rural Development Department, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Phalodi.
4. Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Division Bapini, District Phalodi.
5. Tehsildar, Bapini, District Phalodi.
6. Smt. Purankanwar, The Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Matora, Panchayat Samiti Bapini, District Phalodi.
7. Kishan Dan Charan, Gram Vikash Adhikari, Gram Panchayat Matora, Panchayat Samiti Bapini, District Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(24) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9045/2025

Man Singh S/o Kishore Singh, Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Bijharwali Sodhwali, Tehsil Loonkaransar, District Bikaner.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Bikaner.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Loonkaransar, District Bikaner.
4. Tehsildar, Loonkaransar, District Bikaner.


-----Respondents

(25) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9094/2025

1. Deshraj S/o Taja Ram, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Village Pabudanpura, Gram Panchayat Badha, District Barmer (Raj.).
2. Aidan Ram S/o Peera Ram, Aged About 59 Years, R/o Village Pabudanpura, Gram Panchayat Badha, District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus



1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Barmer.
3. Tehsildar, Sedwa, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(26) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9149/2025

1. Musa Khan S/o Valu Khan, Aged About 49 Years, R/o Village Sukhaliya, Tehsil Chohtan, District Barmer (Raj.)
2. Hasam S/o Haji Khan, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Village Sukhaliya, Tehsil Chohtan, District Barmer (Raj.)

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Barmer.
3. Tehsildar, Chohtan, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(27) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9209/2025

1. Sadik Khan S/o Rahim Khan, Aged About 40 Years, Village Gogliwala, Ward No. 9 Of Gram Panchayat Aaduri, Tehsil Pugal, District Bikaner, (Raj.)
2. Sahu Khan S/o Jalle Khan, Aged About 61 Years, Ward No. 08 Village Ramai, Tehsil Pugal, District Bikaner, Rajasthan.
3. Mange Khan S/o Allah Ditta, Aged About 68 Years, Village Mugrala, Tehsil Pugal, District Bikaner, Rajasthan.
4. Hanif Khan S/o Ganni, Aged About 50 Years, Village Ramai, Tehsil Pugal, District Bikaner, Rajasthan.
5. Habib Khan S/o Hakam Khan, Aged About 51 Years, Village Ramai, Gram Panchayat Aaduri, Tehsil Pugal, District Bikaner, Rajasthan.
6. Anwar Khan S/o Gulam Mohammad, Aged About 51 Years, Ward No. 8 Of Gram Panchayat Aaduri, Tehsil Pugal, District Bikaner, Rajasthan.
7. Gulam Mohammad S/o Hasan Khan, Aged About 70



Years, Ward No. 08 Of Gram Panchayat Aaduri, Tehsil Pugal, District Bikaner, Rajasthan.

8. Aashik Khan S/o Javaye Khan, Aged About 50 Years, Village Gogliwala, Tehsil Pugal, District Bikaner, Rajasthan.

-----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 O Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.)
4. The District Collector, Bikaner (Raj.).
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Bikaner (Raj.).
6. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sub Division Pugal, District Bikaner (Raj.)
7. The Tehsildar Dar, Tehsil Pugal, District Bikaner (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(28) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9252/2025

1. Amra Ram Bhati S/o Shri Sona Ramji Bhati, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Bhation Ka Bera, Ward No. 35, Pipar City, District Jodhpur.
2. Mansoor Ali S/o Mohd. Salim, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Near Meera Temple, Pipar City, District Jodhpur.
3. Abul Kalam S/o Lal Mohd, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Vyapariyon Ka Baas, Pipar City, District Jodhpur.
4. Om Prakash S/o Rana Ram, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Krishna Colony Ward No. 33 Pipad City, District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary, Govt. Of Rajasthan Jaipur.



2. The Local Self Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan Through The Principal Secretary, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Director-Cum-Special Secretary, Local Self Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. Sub Division Magistrate, Pipar City, District Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(29) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9274/2025

1. Mohan Ram S/o Nanak Ram, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Chimana, Tehsil Ghantiyali, District Phalodi (Raj.).
2. Sona Ram S/o Tiku Ram, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Chimana, Tehsil Ghantiyali, District Phalodi (Raj.).
3. Durga Ram S/o Ganesha Ram, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Chimana, Tehsil Ghantiyali, District Phalodi (Raj.).
4. Kishna Ram S/o Sardula Ram, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Chimana, Tehsil Ghantiyali, District Phalodi (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Phalodi.
3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Baap, District Phalodi.
4. Tehsildar, Ghantiyali, District Phalodi.
5. Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Chimana, District Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(30) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9292/2025

1. Ramdhan Meghwal S/o Shri Jaitharam, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Ridmalsar, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
2. Pawan Kumar S/o Shri Magan Lal, Aged About 54 Years, R/o Ward No. 05, Ridmalsar Purohitan, Udasar, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
3. Babulal Jhanwar S/o Shri Tansukh Das Ji, Aged About 55 Years, R/o 14, Swamiyo Ka Mohalla, Near Ramlaxman Aashram, Ridmalsar Purohitan, Udasar, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
4. Mohammed Arif S/o Gulam Kadir, Aged About 60 Years,



R/o Ridmalsar, Bas Siphayan, Bikaner, Rajasthan.

5. Barkat Ali S/o Mohd. Sadik, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Ridmalsar, Bas Siphayan, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
6. Sattar S/o Mohd. Sadik, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Ridmalsar, Bas Siphayan, Bikaner, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Deputy Secretary To Government, Revenue (Group-I) Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj)-302001. Email Address - Ds1.rev@rajasthan.gov.in
2. District Collector, Bikaner, Having Its Office At Collectorate Premises Tehsil And District Bikaner.
3. Sub-Divisional Officer Bikaner, Tehsil Bikaner, District Bikaner.
4. Tehsildar (Land Records) Bikaner, District Bikaner.
5. Gram Panchayat Ridmalsar, Through Its Village Development Officer, Having Its Office At Village Ridmalsar, Tehsil And District Bikaner.
6. State Of Rajasthan Through Secretary To Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department (Panchayati Raj Department), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj)-302001

-----Respondents

(31) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9354/2025

1. Hanumana Ram S/o Chokha Ram, Aged About 62 Years, Village Lunada, Gram Panchayat Lunada Tehsil Batadu District Barmer.
2. Thakra Ram S/o Chokha Ram, Aged About 55 Years, Village Lunada, Gram Panchayat Lunada Tehsil Batadu District Barmer.
3. Bhaga Ram S/o Mula Ram, Aged About 60 Years, Meghwalo Ki Hodi, Village Lunada, Gram Panchayat Lunada Tehsil Batadu District Barmer.
4. Babu Lal S/o Teja Ram, Aged About 49 Years, Village Lunada, Gram Panchayat Lunada Tehsil Batadu District Barmer.
5. Deepa Ram S/o Chotha Ram, Aged About 59 Years,



Village Lunada, Gram Panchayat Lunada Tehsil Batadu
District Barmer.

6. Rama Ram S/o Purkha Ram, Aged About 31 Years,
Village Lunada, Gram Panchayat Lunada Tehsil Batadu
District Barmer.

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department
Of Revenue (Gr.-I), Government Of Rajasthan,
Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Dy. Secretary, Department Of Revenue (Gr.i),
Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And
Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat,
Jaipur.
4. Board Of Revenue, Rajasthan, Ajmer Through Its
Registrar.
5. District Collector (Land Record), Barmer
6. Sub Divisional Officer, Barmer.
7. Tehsildar (Revenue), Batadu District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(32) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9358/2025

1. Mangala Ram S/o Shri Megha Ram, Aged About 64
Years, R/o Shri Ram Nagar, Tehsil Chamu District
Jodhpur Rajasthan.
2. Joga Ram S/o Shri Dharma Ram, Aged About 26 Years,
R/o Shri Ram Nagar, Tehsil Chamu District Jodhpur
Rajasthan.
3. Rewant Ram S/o Bhera Ram, Aged About 63 Years, R/o
Shri Ram Nagar, Tehsil Chamu District Jodhpur
Rajasthan.
4. Bhanwar Lal S/o Manaram, Aged About 22 Years, R/o
Shri Ram Nagar, Tehsil Chamu District Jodhpur
Rajasthan.
5. Prema Ram S/o Shri Jai Ram, Aged About 21 Years, R/o
Shri Ram Nagar, Tehsil Chamu District Jodhpur
Rajasthan.
6. Aadu Ram S/o Khimya Ram, Aged About 72 Years, R/o



Shri Ram Nagar, Tehsil Chamu District Jodhpur Rajasthan.

7. Bana Ram S/o Sura Ram, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Shri Ram Nagar, Tehsil Chamu District Jodhpur Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jodhpur (Raj.).
3. Vikas Adhikari, Panchayat Samiti Chamu, District Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(33) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9386/2025

Aisan Khan Dal S/o Mishri Khan Dal, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Sihaniya, Tehsil Sedwa, District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Sedwa, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(34) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9412/2025

Raychand Ram S/o Moda Ram, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Khetoni Saran And Modoni Sewaron Ki Basti, Tehsil Dhanau, District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Chohtan, District Barmer.
4. Tehsildar, Chohtan, District Barmer.



-----Respondents

(35) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9570/2025

1. Rahim Khan S/o Mubarak Khan, Aged About 39 Years, Village Ganga, Panchayat Samiti Sam, Tehsil Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan. 345001
2. Alam Khan S/o Alisher Khan, Aged About 40 Years, Village Ganga, Panchayat Samiti Sam, Tehsil Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan. 345001
3. Ummed Ali S/o Alisher Khan, Aged About 46 Years, Village Ganga, Panchayat Samiti Sam, Tehsil Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan. 345001
4. Hamal Khan S/o Mira Khan, Aged About 34 Years, Village Ganga, Panchayat Samiti Sam, Tehsil Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan. 345001
5. Pire Khan S/o Roje Khan, Aged About 37 Years, Village Ganga, Panchayat Samiti Sam, Tehsil Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan. 345001
6. Iliyas S/o Mire Khan, Aged About 38 Years, Village Ganga, Panchayat Samiti Sam, Tehsil Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan. 345001
7. Rahman S/o Soyab Khan, Aged About 45 Years, Village Ganga, Panchayat Samiti Sam, Tehsil Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan. 345001
8. Jamin Khan S/o Gage Khan, Aged About 50 Years, Village Ganga, Panchayat Samiti Sam, Tehsil Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan. 345001
9. Kamal Khan S/o Gange Khan, Aged About 30 Years, Village Ganga, Panchayat Samiti Sam, Tehsil Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan. 345001


-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary And Commissioner, Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Jodhpur.
3. The District Collector, Jaisalmer.

-----Respondents

(36) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9606/2025



1. Surendra Kumar S/o Shri Nopa Ram Birda, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 3, Derajsar, Tehsil Ratangarh, Churu
2. Shishpal S/o Shri Dungar Ram, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Derajsar, Tehsil Ratangarh, Churu
3. Richhapal Singh S/o Shri Ishwar Singh, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 2, Derajsar, Tehsil Ratangarh, Churu
4. Kurda Ram S/o Shri Baldeva Ram, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Derajsar, Tehsil Ratangarh, Churu
5. Mahadeva Ram S/o Shri Padma Ram, Aged About 69 Years, Resident Of Derajsar, Tehsil Ratangarh, Churu

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Local Self, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur
2. Commissioner And Secretary To The Govt. And Commissioner, Department Of Local Self, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur
3. Director And Special Secretary, Department Of Local Self, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur
4. Municipal Board, Ratangarh, District Churu Through Its Executive Officer

-----Respondents

(37) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9608/2025

1. Lumba Ram S/o Ranaram, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of Revenue Village Bhiyoni Dhatarwalo Ka Nagar, Gram Panchayat Baytu Bhopji, Tehsil- Baytu, District- Balotara.
2. Jasraj S/o Punmaram, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Revenue Village Bhiyoni Dhatarwalo Ka Nagar, Gram Panchayat Baytu Bhopji, Tehsil- Baytu, District- Balotara.
3. Jagdish Choudhary S/o Gordhan Ram, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Revenue Village Bhiyoni Dhatarwalo Ka Nagar, Gram Panchayat Baytu Bhopji, Tehsil- Baytu, District- Balotara.



4. Bhanwar Lal S/o Genaram, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Revenue Village Bhiyoni Dhatarwalo Ka Nagar, Gram Panchayat Baytu Bhopji, Tehsil- Baytu, District- Balotara.
5. Khartaram S/o Megharam, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Revenue Village Bhiyoni Dhatarwalo Ka Nagar, Gram Panchayat Baytu Bhopji, Tehsil- Baytu, District- Balotara.
6. Kaluram S/o Punmaram, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Revenue Village Bhiyoni Dhatarwalo Ka Nagar, Gram Panchayat Baytu Bhopji, Tehsil- Baytu, District- Balotara.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Balotara.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Baytu, District- Balotara.
4. Tehsildar, Baytu, District- Balotara.

-----Respondents


(38) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9669/2025

1. Nema Ram S/o Shri Budha Ram, Aged About 66 Years, Resident Of Devnagar, Tehsil Balesar District Jodhpur.
2. Hara Ram S/o Shri Bhera Ram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Devnagar, Tehsil Balesar District Jodhpur.
3. Banshi Lal S/o Shri Gulaba Ram, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Devnagar, Tehsil Balesar District Jodhpur.
4. Suresh S/o Shri Paras Ram, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Devnagar, Tehsil Balesar District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

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



4. Tehsildar, Balesar District Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(39) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9671/2025

1. Mala Ram S/o Shri Bhabhuta Ram, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Devnagar Tehsil Balesar District Jodhpur.
2. Suresh Sankhla S/o Paras Ram, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Devnagar Tehsil Balesar District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Revenue (Gr.ii), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Dy. Secretary, Department Of Revenue (Gr.i), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. Board Of Revenue, Rajasthan, Ajmer, Through Registrar.
5. The District Collector, Jodhpur.
6. Gram Panchayat, Devnagar, Panchayat Samiti Balesar District Jodhpur Through Its Village Development Officer.
7. Tehsildar (Revenue), Balesar, District Jodhpur.
8. Sub Divisional Officer, Balesar, District Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(40) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9782/2025

Neeru Solanki W/o Shri Ganpat Singh Solanki, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Chabutare Ke Paas, Jawan Ji Ka Khera, District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector, Rajsamand.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer Amet, District Rajsamand.
4. The Tehsildar, Amet, District Rajsamand.



-----Respondents

(41) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9811/2025

Gram Panchayat Bengati Hadbuji, Through Devi Kanwar, Sarpanch (At Present Prashashak), W/o Of Aam Singh, Age About 52 Years, Resident Of Shivdan Singh Nagar, Begati Kalan, Panchayat Samiti Phalodi, District Phalodi, Rajasthan, 342301.

-----Petitioner


Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary To The Governemnt, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Phalodi.
3. Tehsildar, Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(42) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9893/2025

1. Manaram S/o Chetan Ram, Aged About 66 Years, Resident Of Ummed Nagar, Ghantiyali, Jodhpur (District- Phalodi), Rajasthan, 342311.
2. Mehar Din S/o Ibaru Din, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Imam Nagar, Ghantiyali, Jodhpur (District- Phalodi), Rajasthan, 342311.
3. Mangi Lal S/o Khinya Ram, Aged About 55 Years, Resident If Kukano Ki Dhani, Ghantiyali, Jodhpur (District- Phalodi), Rajasthan, 342311.
4. Sadul Singh S/o Khushal Singh, Aged About 74 Years, Resident Of Kukano Ki Dhani, Ghantiyali, Jodhpur (District- Phalodi), Rajasthan, 342311.
5. Dhudsingh S/o Bhom Singh, Aged About 77 Years, Resident Of Ummed Nagar, Ghantiyali, Jodhpur (District- Phalodi), Rajasthan, 342311.
6. Ramjan S/o Kayam Deen, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Umed Nagar, Sajjananiyo Ki Dhani, Ghantiyali, Jodhpur (District- Phalodi), Rajasthan, 342311.
7. Mag Singh S/o Tej Singh, Aged About 72 Years, Resident Of Rajputo Ki Dhaniya, Imam Nagar, Ghantiyali, Jodhpur (District- Phalodi), Rajasthan, 342311.



8. Madhu Singh Rathore S/o Rajusingh Rathore, Aged About 51 Years, Resident Of Rajput Sabha Bhawan Ke Pass, Pahar Ganj 1St, Mandore Road, Jodhpur, Rajasthan, 342001.
9. Tulcha Ram S/o Mala Ram, Aged About 69 Years, Resident Of Rajputo Ki Dhani, Ummed Nagar, Ghantiyali, Jodhpur (District- Phalodi), Rajasthan, 342311.
10. Karn Singh S/o Aasu Singh, Aged About 64 Years, Resident Of Rajputo Ki Dhani, Ummed Nagar, Ghantiyali, Jodhpur (District- Phalodi), Rajasthan, 342311.
11. Gumana Ram S/o Bala Ram, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Ummed Nagar, Ghantiyali, Jodhpur (District- Phalodi), Rajasthan, 342311.
12. Manak Ram S/o Bhikha Eram, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Dhataravalo Ki Dhaniyan, Ghantiyali, Aau, Jodhpur (District- Phalodi), Rajasthan, 342311.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary T The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Phalodi.
3. Tehsildar, Ghantiyali, District Phalodi.

-----Respondents


(43) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9925/2025

1. Bhera Ram S/o Basti Ram, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Naya Kua, Tehsil Nokhada, District Barmer (Raj.).
2. Babu Ram S/o Duda Ram, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Gandher Meghwalo Ki Dhani, Tehsil Nokhada, District Barmer (Raj.).
3. Aidan Ram S/o Gumana Ram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Dhannebheel Ki Dhani, Tehsil Nokhada, District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.



2. The District Collector, Barmer.
3. Tehsildar, Nokhada, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(44) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9983/2025

1. Dedaram S/o Shri Lumbaram, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Manawas, Panchayat Samit, Sindhari, District Balotra, Rajasthan.
2. Megaram S/o Shri Udaram, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Manawas, Panchayat Samiti, Sindhari, District Balotra, Rajasthan.
3. Hemaram S/o Shri Gouklaram, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Champa Bhakhari, Panchayat Samiti, Sindhari, District Balotra, Rajasthan.
4. Ranaram S/o Shri Chomaram, Aged About 54 Years, R/o Champa Bhakhari, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balotra, Rajasthan.
5. Prabhuram S/o Shri Udaram, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Gogeshwar Nagar, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balotra, Rajasthan.
6. Shankraram S/o Shri Sojaram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Gogeshwar Nagar, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balotra, Rajasthan.
7. Hanumanram S/o Shri Kanaram, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Kadwasaro Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balotra, Rajasthan.
8. Magaram S/o Shri Fasharam, Aged About 68 Years, R/o Kadwasaro Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balotra, Rajasthan.
9. Kaluram S/o Shri Jashram, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Shivji Nagar, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balotra, Rajasthan.
10. Shankraram S/o Shri Manglaram, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Shivji Nagar, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balotra, Rajasthan.
11. Bhuraram S/o Shri Tajaram, Aged About 51 Years, R/o Thyouri Nagar, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balotra, Rajasthan.
12. Khinyaram S/o Shri Dhanaram, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Thyouri Nagar, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District

Balotra, Rajasthan.



-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Balotra.

-----Respondents

(45) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9988/2025

Punamaram S/o Aasha Ram, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Oonchawara, Kashmir, Barmer, Raj.

-----Petitioner


Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Barmer

-----Respondents

(46) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10021/2025

1. Nenu Ram S/o Shri Padma Ram, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Ramdev Nagar, Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).
2. Ismail Khan S/o Raydhan Khan, Aged About 64 Years, R/o Talo Ki Dhani, Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).
3. Gunesha Ram S/o Purkha Ram, Aged About 46 Years, Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).
4. Ibrahim S/o Phakrudin, Aged About 36 Years, Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).
5. Salim S/o Dur Mohammad, Aged About 52 Years, Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).
6. Sadik Khan S/o Samu Khan, Aged About 63 Years, Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).
7. Ajij Khan S/o Meer Mohammad, Aged About 62 Years,



Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).

8. Hidayat Khatu S/o Samu Khan, Aged About 49 Years, Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).
9. Haneeph Khan S/o Akbar Khan, Aged About 36 Years, Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).
10. Abdul Satar S/o Khamish Khan, Aged About 26 Years, Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).
11. Amin Khan S/o Akbar Khan, Aged About 42 Years, Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).
12. Mahesh Kumar S/o Puna Ram, Aged About 26 Years, Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).
13. Foosa Ram Choudhary S/o Surja Ram Choudhary, Aged About 38 Years, Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).
14. Gani Mohammad S/o Amir Deen, Aged About 46 Years, Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).
15. Likhma Ram S/o Nimbu Ram, Aged About 45 Years, Aau, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Phalodi.
3. Sub Division Officer, Aau, District Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(47) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10031/2025

1. Kaluram S/o Dhanaram, Aged About 72 Years, Resident Of Keralanada, Tehsil Lohawat, District Phalodi.
2. Sangramram S/o Haruram, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Keralanada, Tehsil Lohawat, District Phalodi.
3. Jagdishe S/o Manglaram, Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Keralanada, Tehsil Lohawat, District Phalodi.
4. Omprakash S/o Khunaram, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of Keralanada, Tehsil Lohawat, District Phalodi.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The



Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj
Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

2. The District Collector, Phalodi.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Lohawat, District Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(48) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10065/2025

1. Bhera Ram S/o Basti Ram, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Naya Kua, Tehsil Nokhada, District Barmer (Raj.)
2. Babu Ram S/o Duda Ram, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Gandher Meghwalo Ki Dhani, Tehsil Nokhada, District Barmer (Raj.)
3. Aidan Ram S/o Gumana Ram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Dhannebheel Ki Dhani, Tehsil Nokhada, District Barmer (Raj.)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Barmer.
3. Tehsildar, Nokhada, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(49) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10173/2025

1. Mahendra Singh Bishnoi S/o Shri Khanger Ram, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Village Samrathal Nagar, Rohicha Kalan, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
2. Jetharam Godara S/o Shri Hira Ram, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Village Samrathal Nagar, Rohicha Kalan, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
3. Javat Ram S/o Shri Mana Ram, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Samrathal Nagar, Rohicha Kalan, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
4. Papa Ram Vishnoi S/o Shri Jagmal Ram, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Village Samrathal Nagar, Rohicha Kalan, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
5. Khangar Ram S/o Shri Hira Ram, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Village Samrathal Nagar, Rohicha Kalan, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.



-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Deputy Commissioner And Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Jodhpur.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Luni, Jodhpur.
5. Tehsildar (Revenue), Luni, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(50) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10205/2025

1. Ummed Singh S/o Shri Mohan Singh, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Village Jaitpura Khurd, Gram Panchayat Kherwa, Tehsil Degana, District Nagour, Rajasthan.
2. Richapal Singh S/o Shri Mohan Singh, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Village Jaitpura Khurd, Gram Panchayat Kherwa, Tehsil Degana, District Nagour, Rajasthan.
3. Purn Singh S/o Shri Patap Singh, Aged About 51 Years, R/o Village Jaitpura Khurd, Gram Panchayat Kherwa, Tehsil Degana, District Nagour, Rajasthan.
4. Purkha Ram S/o Shri Pacharam, Aged About 54 Years, R/o Village Jaitpura Khurd, Gram Panchayat Kherwa, Tehsil Degana, District Nagour, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Department Of The Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Nagour, District Nagour, Rajasthan.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Degana, District Nagour, Rajasthan.
5. Tehsildar (Land Record) Sanju, District Nagour, Rajasthan.



6. Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Kherwa, Panchayat Samiti Degana, District Nagour, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(51) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10251/2025

1. Nathu Ram S/o Shri Kishana Ram, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Chak No. 3 M.M., Poogal, Tehsil Poogal, District Bikaner.
2. Narayan Ram S/o Shri Kana Ram, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Chak No. 4 M.m., Poogal, Tehsil Poogal, District Bikaner.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Poogal, District Bikaner, Rajasthan.
4. Tehsildar, Poogal, District Bikaner, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(52) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10290/2025

Gram Panchayat, Kana Dev Ka Guda, Through Its Sarpanch, Kana Dev Ka Guda, Tehsil And District Rajsamand, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Rajsamand.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Rajsamand.
4. The Tehsildar, Rajsamand, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(53) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10329/2025

1. Tiku Ram S/o Shera Ram, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Old Village Meghwalon Ki Dhani, New Revenue Village Chouhan Nagar And Amargarh, Tehsil-Gida District Balotra (Raj.).
2. Ummeda Ram S/o Girdhari Ram, Aged About 74 Years,



Resident Of Old Village Meghwalon Ki Dhani, New Revenue Village Chouhan Nagar And Amargarh, Tehsil-Gida District Balotra (Raj.).

3. Bharu Ram S/o Kheta Ram, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Old Village Meghwalon Ki Dhani, New Revenue Village Chouhan Nagar And Amargarh, Tehsil-Gida District Balotra (Raj.).
4. Magga Ram S/o Ladha Ram, Aged About 75 Years, Resident Of Old Village Meghwalon Ki Dhani, New Revenue Village Chouhan Nagar And Amargarh, Tehsil-Gida District Balotra (Raj.).
5. Khema Ram S/o Gordhan Ram, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of Old Village Meghwalon Ki Dhani, New Revenue Village Chouhan Nagar And Amargarh, Tehsil-Gida District Balotra (Raj.).
6. Bhaira Ram S/o Jetha Ram, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Old Village Meghwalon Ki Dhani, New Revenue Village Chouhan Nagar And Amargarh, Tehsil-Gida District Balotra (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The District Collector, Balotra (Raj.).
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Balotra (Raj.).
4. Tehsildar, Gida District Balotra (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(54) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10336/2025

1. Hindu Singh S/o Mangal Singh, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of Village Mahabar Pithal, Gram Panchayat Mutalagala, Tehsil And District Barmer.
2. Hema Ram S/o Natha Ram, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Village Adarsh Mahabar, Gram Panchayat, Mahabar, Tehsil And District Barmer.
3. Prabhu Ram S/o Mana Ram, Aged About 49 Years, Resident Of Village Adarsh Mahabar, Gram Panchayat, Mahabar, Tehsil And District Barmer.



4. Narana Ram S/o Majana Ram, Aged About 73 Years, Resident Of Village Medhoni Garuo Ki Dhani, Tehsil And District Barmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The District Collector, Barmer (Raj.).
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Barmer (Raj.).
4. Tehsildar, Barmer District Balotara (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(55) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10346/2025

1. Babu Dan S/o Shri Chel Dan @ Shanker Dan, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Ward No. 3, Udasar Charnan, Tehsil Sri Dungargarh, District Bikaner.
2. Hetu Dan Charan S/o Shri Durga Dan Charan, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Village Surjansar, Tehsil Sri Dungargarh, District Bikaner.
3. Sanwal Das S/o Shri Gopal Das, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Ward No. 3, Udasar Charnan, Tehsil Sri Dungargarh, District Bikaner.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Bikaner (Raj.).
3. Vikas Adhikari, Panchayat Samiti Sri Dungargarh, District Bikaner.

-----Respondents

(56) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10369/2025

1. Dilip Kumar Choudhary S/o Shri Bihari Lal Choudhary, Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Durga Bhawan Badi Sadari, Chittorgarh (Raj.).
2. Rajendra Singh Gehlot S/o Ganpat Singh Gehlot, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Ajadpura Badi Sadri, Dist



Chittorgarh (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Chittorgarh.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Badi Sadari.
4. The Executive Officer, Municipal Board, Badi Sadari (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(57) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10457/2025

1. Phate Khan S/o Shri Alim Khan, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Solankiyon Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Acharniyon Ki Dhani, Tehsil Gadra Road District Barmer.
2. Talab Khan S/o Shri Achar Khan, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Solankiyon Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Acharniyon Ki Dhani, Tehsil Gadra Road District Barmer.
3. Manoj Kumar S/o Shri Dwarka Ram, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Solankiyon Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Acharniyon Ki Dhani, Tehsil Gadra Road District Barmer.
4. Arabab Khan S/o Saboj Khan, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Solankiyon Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Acharniyon Ki Dhani, Tehsil Gadra Road District Barmer.
5. Mochar Khan S/o Shri Adu Khan, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Solankiyon Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Acharniyon Ki Dhani, Tehsil Gadra Road District Barmer.
6. Narpat Ram S/o Shri Devi Lal, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Solankiyon Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Acharniyon Ki Dhani, Tehsil Gadra Road District Barmer.
7. Panna Ram S/o Shri Tara Ram, Aged About 80 Years, Resident Of Solankiyon Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Acharniyon Ki Dhani, Tehsil Gadra Road District Barmer.
8. Salar Khan S/o Shri Imam Khan, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Solankiyon Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Acharniyon Ki Dhani, Tehsil Gadra Road District Barmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus



1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Revenue (Gr.ii), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Dy. Secretary, Department Of Revenue (Gr.i), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. Board Of Revenue, Rajasthan, Ajmer Through Registrar.
5. The District Collector, Barmer.
6. Sub Divisional Officer, Gadra Road, District Barmer.
7. Tehsildar (Revenue), Gadra Road, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(58) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10466/2025

Bhanwar Singh Rathore S/o Shri Narayan Singh, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Plot No. 36, Hanwant -B, Bjs Colony, Paota, Jodhpur, Tehsil And District Jodhpur (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of The Panchayat Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jodhpur.
3. Vikash Adhikari, Panchayat Samiti Shergarh, District Jodhpur.
4. Gram Panchayat Gada, Panchayat Samiti Shergarh, District Jodhpur Through Its Sarpanch.

-----Respondents

(59) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10481/2025

Prakash Ram S/o Manglaram, Aged About 50 Years, Gopalnagar Village, Gram Panchayat Rarod (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. Secretary To The Government And Commissioner,



Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj,
Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).

3. The District Collector, District Jodhpur (Raj.).
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Bhopalgarh, District Jodhpur (Raj.).
5. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Bhopalgarh, District Jodhpur (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(60) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10538/2025

1. Suresh Patidar S/o Shri Sukhalal, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Pathanpur, Parwa, Sagwara, Dungarpur.
2. Bhemji Patidar S/o Shri Mogji, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Patanpur, Parwa, Dungarpur (Raj.).
3. Dinesh Patidar S/o Shri Deveng Patidar, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Pathapur, Padwa, Tehsil Sagwara, Dungarpur (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Dungarpur (Raj.).
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sagwada, District- Dungarpur (Raj.).
4. The Tehsildar, Tehsil- Sagwada, District- Dungarpur.

-----Respondents

(61) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10559/2025

1. Rakesh Chandra Singada S/o Shri Prabhulal Singada, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Nanabhukiya, Tamtiya, P.o. Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).
2. Gatulal Singada S/o Shri Gama Singada, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Nanabhukiya, Tamtiya, P.o. Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).
3. Bharat Kumar Garasiya S/o Shri Karama Garasiya, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Nanabhukiya, Tamtiya, P.o. Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).

-----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, Banswara (Raj.).
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Banswara (Raj.).
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sub-Division, Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).
7. The Tehsil Dar, Tehsil Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(62) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10563/2025

Deepak Kumar S/o Shri Virji Patel, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Khuta Pharki, District Banswara (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

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, Banswara (Raj.).
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Banswara (Raj.).
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sub-Division, Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).
7. The Tehsildar, Tehsil Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).



-----Respondents

(63) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10583/2025

1. Gemar Singh S/o Kump Singh, Aged About 83 Years, R/o Village Karni Nagar, Gram Panchayat Jhanakli, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer, (Raj.).
2. Sawai Singh S/o Bher Singh, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Kumpsingh Kidhani, Village Karni Nagar, Gram Panchayat Jhanakli, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer, (Raj.).
3. Murar Singh S/o Mishri Singh, Aged About 68 Years, R/o Ratan Singh Ki Dhani, Village Karni Nagar, Gram Panchayat Jhanakli, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer, (Raj.).
4. Bhagwan Singh S/o Mishri Singh, Aged About 64 Years, R/o Ratan Singh Ki Dhani, Village Karni Nagar, Gram Panchayat Jhanakli, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer, (Raj.).
5. Khet Singh S/o Bhanwar Singh, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Ratan Singh Ki Dhani, Village Karni Nagar, Gram Panchayat Jhanakli, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer, (Raj.).
6. Chandan Singh S/o Mishri Singh, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Ratan Singh Ki Dhani, Village Karni Nagar, Gram Panchayat Jhanakli, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer, (Raj.).

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur, (Raj.).
2. The District Collector, Barmer (Raj.).
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Barmer (Raj.).
4. Tehsildar, Tehsil, Gadra Road, Barmer (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(64) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10585/2025

1. Ravji S/o Shri Nanu, Aged About 70 Years, R/o Village Chouthmal, Post Barjadiya, Tehsil Anandpuri, Bagidora, District Banswara (Raj.).



2. Lavji S/o Shir Mavji, Aged About 77 Years, R/o Village Chouthmal, Post Barjadiya, Tehsil Anandpuri, Bagidora, District Banswara (Raj.).
3. Ramesh Chandra Pargee S/o Shri Devi Lal Pargee, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Village Chouthmal, Post Barjadiya, Tehsil Anandpuri, Bagidora, District Banswara (Raj.).

-----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.
3. The Deputy Commissioner Cum Deputy Secretary (First), Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).
4. The District Collector, Banswara (Raj.).
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Banswara (Raj.).
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sub-Division, Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).
7. The Tehsildar, Tehsil Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).

-----Respondents


(65) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10730/2025

1. Bhanwar Singh S/o Shri Roop Singh, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Vijay Singh Nagar, Dewatu, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
2. Deva Ram S/o Shri Ramu Ram, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Kantho Ki Thani, Dewatoo, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
3. Mohanlalsuthar S/o Shri Chanana Ram, Aged About 64 Years, Resident Of Ramsar, Lorta, Achlawata, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
4. Babu Singh S/o Shribhanwar Singh, Aged About 71 Years, Resident Of 113, Chavandsagar, Nayabera, Dewatoo, Shergarh, Disgtrict Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
5. Khet Singh S/o Shri Mod Singh, Aged About 41 Years,



Resident Of Dedhachak 3, Shiv Nath Nagar, Dedhachak III, Jodhpur, Deda Hapan, Rajasthan.

6. Jethu Singh S/o Shribhanwarsingh, Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Village Dewatoo, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
7. Narayan Ram S/o Shri Moda Ram, Aged About 66 Years, Resident Of Village Dewatoo, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
8. Foolama Ram S/o Shri Naru Ram, Aged About 43 Years, Resident Of Kathon Ki Dhani, Village Dewatoo, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
9. Dungar Singh S/o Shri Devi Singh, Aged About 80 Years, Resident Of Sohan Nagar, Village Dewatoo, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
10. Sawai Singh S/o Shri Ladhusingh, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Village Dewatoo, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
11. Prahlad S/o Shri Naru Ram, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Greval Road, Kathon Ki Dhani, Dewatoo, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
12. Guman Singh S/o Shrijugat Singh, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Dedha 3, Dedhachak III, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
13. Durga Ram S/o Shri Ruga Ram, Aged About 49 Years, Resident Of Naiyo Ki Dhani, Dewatoo, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
14. Ugam Singh S/o Shri Jugatsingh, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Dedhachak III, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
15. Abhay Singh S/o Shriguman Singh, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Dedhachak III, Dedahapan, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
16. Ugam Singh S/o Shrikishor Singh, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Nayabera, Dewatoo, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
17. Dalpat Singh S/o Shri Ranjit Singh, Aged About 66 Years, Resident Of 351, Nayabera, Devatu, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
18. Sumer Singh S/o Shri Bhanwar Singh, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Vijay Singh Nagar, Dewatoo, District



Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

19. Chhatur Singh S/o Shri Guman Singh, Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Vijay Singh Nagar, Dewatoo, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
20. Ummed Singh S/o Shri Dungar Singh, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Vijay Singh Nagar, Dewatoo, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
21. Achala Ram S/o Shri Uda Ram, Aged About 49 Years, Resident Of Sutharo Ki Dhaniya, Lortaachlawata, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
22. Mangilalsuthar S/o Shri Chunnilal, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of Kothapet, Saroornagar, K.v. Rangareddy, Andhra Pradesh.
23. Hukama Ram S/o Shri Svarupa Ram, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of 158, Dewatufanteke Pas Ki Dhaniya, Ramsar, Lorta Achlawata, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
24. Jetha Ram Suthar S/o Shri Raju Ram, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of 57A1, Sikh Village Bowenpally, Tirumalagiri, Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh.
25. Hanuvat Singh S/o Shri Guman Singh, Aged About 54 Years, Resident Of Vijay Singh Nagar, Balesarsatta, Dewatoo, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
26. Mool Singh S/o Shri Sang Singh, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Village Dewatoo, Shergarh, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
27. Sumer Singh S/o Shri Rewatsingh, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Village Dewatoo, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector, Jodhpur.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer Balesar, District Shergah.
4. The Tehsildar, Chamu, District Jodhpur (Rural).

-----Respondents



1. Jala Ram S/o Shri Momta Ram, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Shri Ram Nagar, Tehsil Osian, Khabra Khurd, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
2. Omprakash S/o Shri Ummeda Ram, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Shri Ram Nagar, Tehsil Osian, Khabra Khurd, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
3. Rupa Ram S/o Shri Gaja Ram, Aged About 69 Years, R/o House No. 603, Beradon Ki Dhnaï, Ps Osian, Khabra Khurd, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
4. Poona Ram S/o Shri Durga Ram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Beniwalo Ki Dhani, Sri Ram Nagar, Tehsil Osian, Khabra Khurd, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
5. Hari Ram S/o Shri Chuna Ram, Aged About 73 Years, R/o House No. 594, Godaro Ki Dhani, Sri Ram Nagar, Tehsil Osian, Khabra Khurd, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Deputy Commissioner And Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents


(67) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10736/2025

1. Subhash Chandra Damor S/o Shri Ganpatlal Damor, Aged About 58 Years, R/o Village Ward No.06, Samisera, Chandwara, P.o. Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).
2. Praveen Kumar Damor S/o Shri Hargovindji Damor, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Village Ward No.06, Samisera, Chandwara, P.o. Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).

-----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, Banswara (Raj.).
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Banswara (Raj.).
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sub-Division, Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).
7. The Tehsil Dar, Tehsil Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(68) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10761/2025

Anop Singh S/o Shri Bhanwar Singh, Aged About 58 Years, R/o Village Krishna Nagar, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector, District Phalodi, Rajasthan.
3. The Tehsildar, Tehsil Aau, District Phalodi, Rajasthan.
4. The Gram Panchayat Shri Krishna Nagar, Panchayati Samiti Aau, District Phalodi, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(69) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10782/2025

1. Haji Sheku Khan S/o Haji Alim Khan, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Dholakiya, Tehsil Shiv, Dist Barmer, (Raj.).
2. Gopa Khan S/o Isan Khan, Aged About 67 Years, Resident Of Village Dholakiya, Tehsil Shiv, Dist Barmer, (Raj.).
3. Bhutta Khan S/o Pandhi Khan, Aged About 47 Years, Resident Of Village Dholakiya, Tehsil Shiv, Dist Barmer, (Raj.).
4. Abdul Khan S/o Suleman Khan, Aged About 46 Years,



Resident Of Village Dholakiya, Tehsil Shiv, Dist Barmer, (Raj.).

5. Fota Khan S/o Alabaraya Khan, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of Village Dholakiya, Tehsil Shiv, Dist Barmer, (Raj.).
6. Jabal Khan S/o Mohammad Khan, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Village Dholakiya, Tehsil Shiv, Dist Barmer, (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary To The Government, Department Of Panchayati Raj And Rural Development, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. District Collector, Barmer (Raj.).
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Shiv, Barmer (Raj.).
4. Tehsildar, Shiv, District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Respondents


(70) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10789/2025

1. Padma Ram S/o Punma Ram, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village Ramdev Nagar, Ranasar Kalla, Tehsil Dhorimnna, District Barmer.
2. Surjan Ram S/o Hanuman Ram, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Village Ramdev Nagar, Ranasar Kalla, Tehsil Dhorimnna, District Barmer.
3. Rakesh Kumar S/o Heera Ram, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Village Ramdev Nagar, Ranasar Kalla, Tehsil Dhorimnna, District Barmer.
4. Bhika Ram S/o Mangla Ram, Aged About 53 Years, R/o Village Ramdev Nagar, Ranasar Kalla, Tehsil Dhorimnna, District Barmer.
5. Om Prakash S/o Sukh Ram, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Ramdev Nagar, Ranasar Kalla, Tehsil Dhorimnna, District Barmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of Panchyat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. District Collector, Barmer.



3. Sub Divisional Officer, Dhorimnna, District Phalodi.
4. Tehsildar Dhorimnna, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(71) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10814/2025

Budhar Ram Khichar S/o Shri Sona Ram Khichar, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Khicharo Ki Dhani (Radkabera), Tehsil And District Phalodi.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Jaipur
2. The District Collector, Phalodi
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Phalodi, District Phalodi.
4. Block Development Officer (Bdo), Panchayat Samiti, Ghantiyali, Tehsil And District Phalodi
5. Tehsildar, Phalodi
6. Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Radkabera, Tehsil And District Phalodi

-----Respondents

(72) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10815/2025

Sumari W/o Amin Khan, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Mandhla, Harnau, Loonar, District Jaisalmer.

-----Petitioner

Versus


1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary And Commissioner (Panchayati Raj Department), Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jaisalmer Having Its Office At Tehsil And District Jaisalmer.

-----Respondents

(73) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10819/2025

Jaiprakash S/o Shri Bheraram, Aged About 33 Years, R/o 353, Rataniya Ki Dhani, Berado Ka Bas, Village Daukiyo Ka Bas, Tehsil Osian, District Jodhpur (Raj.).

-----Petitioner



1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Collector, Jodhpur (Raj.)
3. Vikas Adhikari, Panchayat Samiti Tinwari, District Jodhpur.
4. Gram Panchayat Daukiyo Ka Bas, Panchayat Samiti Tinwari District Jodhpur Through Its Sarpanch.

-----Respondents

(74) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10863/2025

1. Manvendra Singh S/o Shri Bhera Ram, Aged About 36 Years, Residents Of Village Hanuwantpura, Gram Panchayat Arniyali, District Barmer.
2. Bhanwar Lal S/o Shri Jodha Ram, Aged About 52 Years, Residents Of Village Hanuwantpura, Gram Panchayat Arniyali, District Barmer.
3. Kachhaba Ram S/o Shri Jetha Ram, Aged About 48 Years, Residents Of Village Hanuwantpura, Gram Panchayat Arniyali, District Barmer.

-----Petitioners

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, Barmer.

-----Respondents

(75) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10867/2025

1. Moola Ram S/o Shri Ghamanda Ram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Jatoni Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat, Chainpura, District Barmer.
2. Teja Ram, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Village Jatoni Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat, Chainpura, District Barmer.

-----Petitioners

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, Barmer.

-----Respondents

(76) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10897/2025

Sunil Godara S/o Girdhari Ram, Aged About 38 Years, Resident
Of Ram Shakti Nagar, Panchayat Udaniyon Ki Dhani, Tehsil And
District Phalodi, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Special Secretary,
Revenue Department (Group-1), Government Of
Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Rajasthan).
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary,
Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan,
Secretariat, Jaipur (Rajasthan).
3. The Registrar, Board Of Revenue, Rajasthan, Ajmer
(Rajasthan).
4. The District Collector (Land Records), Phalodi (Raj.).
5. Sub Divisional Officer, Tehsil Phalodi, District Phalodi,
(Rajasthan).
6. The Tehsildar (Land Records), Tehsil Phalodi, District
Phalodi, (Rajasthan).
7. The Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat, Udaniya Ki Dhani,
Tehsil Phalodi, District Phalodi (Rajasthan).

-----Respondents


(77) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10903/2025

Smt. Salmat W/o Shri Pathan Khan, Aged About 37 Years,
Resident Of Prahlad Nagar, Tehsil Fulsund, District Jaisalmer- At
Present Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat, Sohanpura, District
Jaisalmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary Rural
Development And Panchayati Raj Department,
Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Jodhpur.



3. The District Collector, Jaisalmer (Raj.).

----Respondents

(78) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10951/2025

Kadar Khan S/o Aziz Khan, Aged About 67 Years, R/o Kaluji Ki Dhani, Tehsil Falsund, District Jaisalmer, At Present Working As Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Swamiji Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Bhaniyana, District Jaisalmer (Raj.)

----Petitioner


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jaisalmer (Raj.).
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jaisalmer.

----Respondents

(79) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10968/2025

1. Kailash Potaliya S/o Shri Banka Ram, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Village Karnooni Potaliyon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Matasar, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
2. Jogendra Choudhary S/o Shri Baluram, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Village Karnooni Potaliyon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Matasar, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
3. Suresh S/o Shri Rekharam, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Karnooni Potaliyon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Matasar, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
4. Bhuraram S/o Shri Birmaram, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Karnooni Potaliyon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Matasar, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
5. Krishan Kumar S/o Shri Jagmal Ram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Karnooni Potaliyon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Matasar, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
6. Andaram S/o Shri Rekharam, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Karnooni Potaliyon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Matasar, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
7. Heeraram S/o Shri Magluram, Aged About 81 Years, R/o



Village Karnooni Potaliyon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Matasar, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.

8. Parmaram S/o Shri Bhooraram, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Karnooni Potaliyon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Matasar, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
9. Chaturaram S/o Shri Heeraram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Karnooni Potaliyon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Matasar, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
10. Megharam S/o Shri Heeraram, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Karnooni Potaliyon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Matasar, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
11. Vinod S/o Shri Bankaram, Aged About 19 Years, R/o Village Karnooni Potaliyon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Matasar, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Barmer.

-----Respondents

(80) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10978/2025

Maghraj Choudhary S/o Achla Ram, Aged About 37 Years, Lunavpura, Tehsil Balesar, District Jodhpur (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Jodhpur.
3. Sub Division Officer, Balesar, District Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(81) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10991/2025

Islam Khan S/o Shri Badhe Khan, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Khejarli, Tehsil Bhaniyana, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.



----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jaisalmer (Raj.).
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Bhaniyana, District Jaisalmer.

----Respondents

(82) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10992/2025

Nepal Singh Chundawat S/o Ganpat Singh, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Jogras, Tehsil And District Bhilwara (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Bhilwara
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Bhilwara, District Bhilwara.

----Respondents

(83) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10993/2025

Mithu Puri Goswami S/o Shri Madho Puri Goswami, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Village Dangra, Tehsil And District Bhilwara (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Bhilwara.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Bhilwara, District Bhilwara.

----Respondents

(84) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10994/2025

Sukh Lal S/o Shri Bheru Das, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Village Jagdari, Po Dudiya, District Bhilwara.

----Petitioner

Versus



1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Bhilwara.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Bhilwara, District Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(85) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10995/2025

Ladu Lal Balai S/o Rewat Lal, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Bagoliya, Badi, Tehsil And District Bhilwara (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Bhilwara
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Bhilwara, District Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(86) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10997/2025

Narayan Lal S/o Shri Kanhaiyalal, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Village Sunderpura, Tehsil And District Bhilwara (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Bhilwara.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Bhilwara, District Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(87) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 10998/2025

Man Singh S/o Shri Beejraj Singh, Aged About 47 Years, Resident Of Village Bhainsakundal Tehsil And District Bhilwara.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of



Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.

2. The District Collector, Bhilwara.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Bhilwara, District Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(88) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11001/2025

Kishana Ram S/o Shri Teja Ram, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Rupaniyo Ki Dhani, Roopsar, Bhikodai, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jaisalmer (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(89) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11006/2025

1. Jalam Singh S/o Shri Kesar Singh, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Toga, Tehsil Fatehgarh, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
2. Jalal Khan S/o Shri Mubarkh Khan, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Magare Ki Dhani, Toga, Tehsil Fatehgarh, District Jaisalmer

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jaisalmer (Raj.)
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jaisalmer.

-----Respondents

(90) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11009/2025

Chawand Singh S/o Shri Santok Singh, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Ojaghar, Post Sangawa, District And Tehsil Bhilwara (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary,



Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.

2. The District Collector, Bhilwara.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Bhilwara, District Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(91) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11010/2025

Hema Ram S/o Shri Padma Ram, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Doongre Ki Dhani, Bhaniyana, Jaisalmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Jaisalmer, District Jaisalmer.
3. The Sub Division Officer, Sub Division Bhaniyana, District Jaisalmer.
4. The Gram Panchayat Bhaniyana, Through Its Sarpanch, Bhaniyana, Jaisalmer.
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jaisalmer.

-----Respondents

(92) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11013/2025

1. Iqbal S/o Islam Ali, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Phusasar, Tehsil Bhaniyana, District Jaisalmer (Raj.).
2. Ramzan S/o Inayat Khan, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Phusasar, Tehsil Bhaniyana, District Jaisalmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary And Commissioner (Panchayati Raj Department), Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector Jaisalmer, Having Its Office At Tehsil And District Jaisalmer.

-----Respondents

(93) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11016/2025

Sobat Ali S/o Kherdin Khan, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of



Matujo Ki Dhani, Bhikhodai Nai, Bhikhodai, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector, Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

(94) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11017/2025

1. Heera Ram S/o Sanga Ram, Aged About 51 Years, Village Moteesara, District Barmer.
2. Padma Ram S/o Bhera Ram, Aged About 44 Years, Panyala Khurd, District Barmer.
3. Rama Ram S/o Taga Ram, Aged About 52 Years, Village Bhalkhari, District Barmer.
4. Bhana Ram S/o Sanga Ram, Aged About 64 Years, Village Moteesara, District Barmer.
5. Kheraj Ram S/o Fusa Ram, Aged About 53 Years, Village Bhalkhari, District Barmer.
6. Chagana Ram S/o Pratapa Ram, Aged About 35 Years, Village Gadesara, District Barmer.
7. Likhma Ram S/o Dalu Ram, Aged About 29 Years, Village Bhalkhari, District Barmer.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Balotra.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Barmer.

----Respondents

(95) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11019/2025

Karna Ram S/o Shri Maga Ram, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Village Mahabar Peethal, District Barmer (Raj.).



-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Barmer Rural, Barmer.
4. Tehsildar, Barmer Rural, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(96) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11020/2025

1. Bhanwar Ram S/o Kesa Ram, Aged About 51 Years, Govindpura, Baori, District Jodhpur, (Raj.)
2. Bala Ram S/o Aasu Ram, Aged About 65 Years, Govindpura, Baori, District Jodhpur (Raj.)
3. Peer Singh S/o Dhool Singh, Aged About 66 Years, Govindpura, Baori, District Jodhpur (Raj.)
4. Bhana Ram S/o Puna Ram, Aged About 51 Years, Govindpura, Baori, District Jodhpur (Raj.)
5. Aadu Ram S/o Anada Ram, Aged About 60 Years, Govindpura, Baori, District Jodhpur (Raj.)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jodhpur.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Jodhpur.

-----Respondents


(97) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11023/2025

Kana Ram S/o Uda Ram, Aged About 55 Years, Dholanada, Tehsil Adel, District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.



2. The District Collector, Barmer.

-----Respondents

(98) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11024/2025

1. Bhagwana Ram S/o Magna Ram, Aged About 65 Years, Village Post Asada, Tehsil Pachpadra, District Balotra, Rajasthan.
2. Varinga Ram S/o Prahalad Ram, Aged About 58 Years, Village Post Asada, Tehsil Pachpadra, District Balotra, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of Panchayat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. District Collector, Balotra, Rajasthan.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Balotra, District Balotra, Rajasthan.
4. The Tehsildar Pachpadra, District Balotra, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(99) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11025/2025

1. Jetha Ram S/o Late Budha Ram, Aged About 50 Years, 86, Patelon Ka Bas, Sanjhipura, Gadhwara, Tehsil Rohet, District Pali, Rajasthan.
2. Laxman Ram S/o Late Nema Ram, Aged About 53 Years, Aam Chhota, Sajjanpura, Tehsil Rohet, District Pali, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of Panchayat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. District Collector, Pali, Rajasthan.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Rohet, District Pali, Rajasthan.
4. The Tehsildar Rohet, District Pali, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(100) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11031/2025

1. Champa Lal Janwa S/o Modi Lal Janwa, Aged About 45 Years, Village Nawaniya, Vallabh Nagar, Nawaniya,



District Udaipur (Rajasthan)

2. Maangu S/o Pema, Aged About 52 Years, Village Nawaniya-B, Krishi Farm, Tehsil Vallabh Nagar, District Udaipur (Rajasthan)
3. Dharmesh Ranka S/o Prakash Chandra Ranka, Aged About 35 Years, 408, Jain Street, Near Amba Mata Mandir, Nawaniya, District Udaipur (Rajasthan)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary And Commissioner, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan Jaipur (Rajasthan)
2. Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan Through Additional Chief Secretary
3. The District Collector, Udaipur (Rajasthan)
4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Vallabh Nagar, District Udaipur (Rajasthan)
5. The Tehsildar, Vallabh Nagar, District Udaipur (Rajasthan)
6. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Udaipur (Rajasthan)
7. The Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Vallabh Nagar, District Udaipur (Rajasthan)

-----Respondents

(101) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11033/2025

Ramesh S/o Kohala Ram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Dhudhwa Der, District Barmer (Balotra), Raj.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Balotra
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Pachpadra, District Balotra
4. Tehsildar, Pachpadra, District Balotra

-----Respondents



(102) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11038/2025

1. Fate Mohmmad S/o Bhikha Khan, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Village Aasari Sindhiyan, Gram Panchayat Aasari, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer (Raj.).
2. Kesara Ram S/o Chatu Ram, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Village Aasari Sindhiyan, Gram Panchayat Aasari, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer (Raj.).
3. Magan Khan S/o China Khan, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Village Aasari Sindhiyan, Gram Panchayat Aasari, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer (Raj.).
4. Dinu Khan S/o Ismail Khan, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Aasari Sindhiyan, Gram Panchayat Aasari, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer (Raj.).

-----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, Barmer (Raj.).
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Barmer (Raj.).
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sub-Division, Gadra Road, District Barmer (Raj.).
7. The Tehsildar, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Respondents


(103) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11042/2025

Gangaram S/o Narna Ram, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Village Khema Baba Nagar, Nagani Dhatarwalo Ki Dhani, Tehsil Baytu District Barmer (Balotra), Raj.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panachayati Raj, Government Of



Rajasthan Secretariat, Jaipur.

2. District Collector, Balotra
3. The Sub- Divisional Officer, Baytu, District Balotra
4. Tehsildar, Baytu, District Balotra.

-----Respondents

(104) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11047/2025

1. Anwar Khan S/o Shri Mohammad Khan, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Pol Ji Dairy, Post Bhoo, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
2. Gafur Khan, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Pol Ji Dairy, Post Bhoo, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
3. Raju Ram S/o Shri Bhagga Ram, Aged About 45 Years, Resident Of Jogga, Post Bhoo, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
4. The Tehsildar, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(105) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11048/2025

1. Saddam Husain S/o Sajan Khan, Aged About 31 Years, Kolu Tala, Ramgarh, Tehsil Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
2. Kherdin Khan S/o Dene Khan, Aged About 60 Years, Kolu Tala, Ramgarh, Tehsil Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
3. Aadat Khan S/o Alam Khan, Aged About 32 Years, Kolu Tala, Ramgarh, Tehsil Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.



3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
4. The Tehsildar, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(106) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11049/2025

1. Surta Ram S/o Shri Bhaga Ram, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Devnagar, Santora Khurd, Tehsil Tinwari, Jodhpur.
2. Likhma Ram S/o Shri Amana Ram, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Devnagar, Santora Khurd, Tehsil Tinwari, Jodhpur.
3. Sukha Ram S/o Shri Kumbha Ram, Aged About 56 Years, R/o Devnagar, Santora Khurd, Tehsil Tinwari, Jodhpur.
4. Moti Ram S/o Shri Bhaga Ram, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Devnagar, Santora Khurd, Tehsil Tinwari, Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Deputy Commissioner And Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(107) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11052/2025

Sawai Ram S/o Magna Ram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Sarannagar, Post Kalau, Tehsil Chetrawa, District Phalodi (Raj.).


-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Phalodi (Raj.).
3. Sub Division Officer, Dechu, District Phalodi.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(108) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11053/2025



Ganga Ram S/o Aasha Ram, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Themba, Tehsil Sedwa, District Barmer (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Barmer.
3. Tehsildar, Sedwa, District Barmer.

----Respondents

(109) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11056/2025

1. Arbab Khan S/o Haji Ali, Aged About 59 Years, Ali Ki Dhani, Dedusar, Barmer.
2. Gordhan Ram S/o Joga Ram, Aged About 51 Years, Ali Ki Dhani, Dedusar, Barmer.
3. Mohmmad Khan S/o Sileman Khan, Aged About 35 Years, Ali Ki Dhani, Dedusar, Barmer.

----Petitioners


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Department Of Revenue (Group I), Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur Through Joint Secretary.
3. Board Of Revenue, Ajmer Through Registrar.
4. Divisional Commissioner, Jodhpur.
5. District Collector, Barmer.
6. Sub Divisional Officer, Tehsil Chouhtan, District Barmer.
7. Tehsildar, Tehsil Chouhtan, District Barmer.

----Respondents

(110) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11059/2025

1. Gafoor S/o Kamal Khan, Aged About 53 Years, R/o Tamachi Ki Gafan, Tehsil Chouhtan, District Barmer.
2. Hameed S/o Taiyab, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Tamachi Ki Gafan, Tehsil Chouhtan, District Barmer.
3. Ramda, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Tamachi Ki Gafan,



Tehsil Chouhtan, District Barmer.

4. Akbar S/o Edhi Khan, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Tamachi Ki Gafan, Tehsil Chouhtan, District Barmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Chouhtan District Barmer.
4. Tehsildar, Chouhtan District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(111) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11060/2025

Satynarayan Singh Rajpurohit S/o Shri Ratan Singh Rajpurohit, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Rajpurohito Ka Bas, Khichan, Tehsil Phalodi District Phalodi (Raj.).

-----Petitioner


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Phalodi (Raj.).
3. Sub Division Officer, Phalodi, District Phalodi.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(112) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11061/2025

1. Imam Khan S/o Modal Khan, Aged About 53 Years, R/o Village Kesulapana, Panchayat Samiti Bhaniyana, Tehsil Falsund, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
2. Pema Ram S/o Gagram Mil, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Village Kesulapana, Panchayat Samiti Bhaniyana, Tehsil Falsund, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
3. Khame Khan S/o Bhadhid Khan, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village Kesulapana, Panchayat Samiti Bhaniyana, Tehsil Falsund, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
4. Hadmana Ram S/o Magla Ram, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Village Kesulapana, Panchayat Samiti Bhaniyana,



Tehsil Falsund, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.

5. Taib Khan S/o Bacchu Khan, Aged About 84 Years, R/o Village Kesulapana, Panchayat Samiti Bhaniyana, Tehsil Falsund, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary And Commissioner, Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Jodhpur.
3. The District Collector, Jaisalmer
4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Bhaniyana, District Jaisalmer.

-----Respondents


(113) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11062/2025

1. Badri Jat S/o Shri Babu Jat, Aged About 59 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
2. Bhanwar Lal Balai S/o Shri Hema Balai, Aged About 57 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
3. Ganga Ram S/o Shri Madhu Jat, Aged About 41 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
4. Badri Lal Kumhar S/o Shri Raimal Kumhar, Aged About 68 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
5. Ladu Lal Jat S/o Shri Udairam, Aged About 51 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
6. Badri Lal Jat S/o Shri Udairam, Aged About 51 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
7. Balu Ram Jat S/o Shri Nanuram Jat, Aged About 65 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
8. Jamna Lal Kumhar S/o Shri Raimal, Aged About 59 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat




Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).

9. Murlidhar Jat S/o Shri Udairam Jat, Aged About 33 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
10. Heera Jat S/o Shri Kalu Jat, Aged About 73 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
11. Sawar Mal Jat S/o Shri Dayaram Jat, Aged About 34 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
12. Dai Lal Jat S/o Shri Kastoor Jat, Aged About 35 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
13. Dhanna Jat S/o Shri Magna Jat, Aged About 81 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
14. Mula Jat S/o Shri Juvara Jat, Aged About 68 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
15. Devkishan S/o Shri Ganga Ram Suthar, Aged About 34 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
16. Mukesh Sharma S/o Shri Shyam Lal, Aged About 37 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
17. Mahaveer Jat S/o Shri Kastoor Jat, Aged About 34 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
18. Heera Balai S/o Shri Uda Balai, Aged About 61 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
19. Murlidhar Vaishnav S/o Shri Bherudas, Aged About 30 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
20. Narayan Lal Balai S/o Shri Mula Balai, Aged About 42 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
21. Udai Ram Vaishnav S/o Shri Ramswaroop, Aged About 41 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram



Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).

22. Paras Mal Jat S/o Shri Chotu Singh, Aged About 31 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
23. Ugam Lal S/o Shri Deva, Aged About 36 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
24. Leheru Lal Jat S/o Shri Hajari Jat, Aged About 39 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
25. Ladu Lal S/o Shri Jodha Balai, Aged About 62 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
26. Mangu Suthar S/o Shri Naru Suthar, Aged About 66 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
27. Bheru Lal S/o Shri Badri Lal, Aged About 40 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
28. Kana Bairwa S/o Shri Magana, Aged About 41 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
29. Sohan Lal Luhar S/o Shri Salag Ram Luhar, Aged About 69 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
30. Geeta Devi Jat W/o Shri Badri Jat, Aged About 36 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
31. Prakash Chandra Luhar S/o Shri Ladu Lal, Aged About 35 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
32. Badri Lal Jat S/o Shri Nanu Jat, Aged About 41 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
33. Chitar Sen S/o Shri Mohan Sen, Aged About 51 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat



Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).

34. Nand Ram Jat S/o Shri Ganga Ram, Aged About 56 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
35. Gopi Jat S/o Shri Nand Ram, Aged About 61 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
36. Babu Lal Kumhar S/o Shri Nanu Ram, Aged About 24 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
37. Gopal Dholi S/o Shri Magna, Aged About 49 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
38. Ratan Lal S/o Shri Lehru Jat, Aged About 40 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
39. Lehru Gadri S/o Shri Mangu, Aged About 64 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
40. Hajari Balai S/o Shri Devji Balai, Aged About 65 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
41. Chaturbhuj Jat S/o Shri Ekling Jat, Aged About 64 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
42. Madhu Jat S/o Shri Rupa Jat, Aged About 72 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
43. Kalu Lal Jat S/o Shri Nathu Jat, Aged About 75 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
44. Shambhu Luhar S/o Shri Pyara, Aged About 65 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
45. Bhanwar Kumhar S/o Shri Raimal, Aged About 49 Years, Residents Of Village Daulatpura, Gram Panchayat Jorawarpura, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus



1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector, Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(114) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11063/2025

Poonamchand S/o Purkha Ram, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Janiyo Ki Basti, Tehsil Dhanau, District Barmer.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Chohtan, District Barmer
4. Tehsildar, Dhanau, District Barmer.


-----Respondents

(115) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11064/2025

1. Ramu Ram S/o Shri Gumani Ram, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Ramdevpura Chadi Tehsil Aau District Phalodi.
2. Babu Singh S/o Shri Kan Singh, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Ramdevpura Chadi Tehsil Aau District Phalodi.
3. Ramu Ram S/o Shri Ghamda Ram, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Ramdevpura Chadi Tehsil Aau District Phalodi.
4. Shrawan Kumar S/o Shri Pema Ram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Ramdevpura Chadi Tehsil Aau District Phalodi.

-----Petitioners

Versus



1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Phalodi.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Aau District Phalodi.
4. Tehsildar, Aau District Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(116) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11065/2025

1. Damar Singh S/o Aamb Singh, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Village Agoriya, Tehsil Sheo, District Barmer (Raj.).
2. Dalpat Singh S/o Shri Hem Singh, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Village Agoriya, Tehsil Sheo, District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer (Raj.).
3. Sub Division Officer, Sheo, District Barmer.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Barmer.

-----Respondents


(117) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11069/2025

1. Trilok Singh S/o Bagta Ram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Mohar Nagar, Chitar Bera, Bhojasar, Jodhpur, District- Phalodi, Rajasthan-342311
2. Manohar Lal S/o Ramchandra, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Mohar Nagar, Bhojasar, Jodhpur, District Phalodi, Rajasthan 342311.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Phalodi.
3. Sdo, Ghantiyali, Phalodi.



4. Tehsildar, Ghantiyali, Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(118) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11070/2025

1. Majna S/o Jamin, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Rajgarh, Ammi Mohammad Shah Ki Basti, Tehsil Dhanau, District Barmer.
2. Gulla Khan S/o Arab Khan, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Rajgarh, Ammi Mohammad Shah Ki Basti, Tehsil Dhanau, District Barmer.
3. Tamachi Khan S/o Hamid Khan, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Rajgarh, Ammi Mohammad Shah Ki Basti, Tehsil Dhanau, District Barmer.
4. Mir Mohammad S/o Anwar Khan, Aged About 54 Years, R/o Rajgarh, Ammi Mohammad Shah Ki Basti, Tehsil Dhanau, District Barmer.
5. Hamir Khan S/o Akbar Khan, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Rajgarh, Ammi Mohammad Shah Ki Basti, Tehsil Dhanau, District Barmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Officer Chouhtan, District Barmer.
4. Tehsildar Dhanau, District Barmer.

-----Respondents


(119) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11071/2025

Hajari Dan S/o Mangal Dan, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Muhado Ki Dhani Dharvi Kalla, Tehsil Sheo, District Barmer.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Sheo, District Barmer.



4. Tehsildar, Sheo, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(120) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11073/2025

1. Babu Lal Choudhary S/o Shri Chandraram, Aged About 49 Years, Resident Of Village Budiyaon Ka Tala, Leelsar, Jasnath Nagar, Gram Panchayat, Pavariya Tala, Panchayat Samiti Chauhan, District Barmer.
2. Asu Ram S/o Shri Dharma Ram, Aged About 47 Years, Resident Of Village Budiyaon Ka Tala, Leelsar, Jasnath Nagar, Gram Panchayat, Pavariya Tala, Panchayat Samiti Chauhan, District Barmer.
3. Jasa Ram S/o Shri Deva Ram, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Village Budiyaon Ka Tala, Leelsar, Jasnath Nagar, Gram Panchayat, Pavariya Tala, Panchayat Samiti Chauhan, District Barmer.
4. Dera Ram S/o Shri Dharma Ram, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Budiyaon Ka Tala, Leelsar, Jasnath Nagar, Gram Panchayat, Pavariya Tala, Panchayat Samiti Chauhan, District Barmer.
5. Hukama Ram, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Village Budiyaon Ka Tala, Leelsar, Jasnath Nagar, Gram Panchayat, Pavariya Tala, Panchayat Samiti Chauhan, District Barmer.
6. Jagdish S/o Shri Dera Ram, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Leelsar, Jasnath Nagar, Gram Panchayat, Pavariya Tala, Panchayat Samiti Chauhan, District Barmer.
7. Jugata Ram S/o Shri Joga Ram, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Leelsar, Jasnath Nagar, Gram Panchayat, Pavariya Tala, Panchayat Samiti Chauhan, District Barmer.
8. Sata Ram S/o Shri Dharma Ram, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Leelsar, Jasnath Nagar, Gram Panchayat, Pavariya Tala, Panchayat Samiti Chauhan, District Barmer.
9. Gorkha Ram S/o Shri Joga Ram, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Budiyaon Ka Tala, Leelsar, Jasnath Nagar, Gram Panchayat, Pavariya Tala, Panchayat Samiti Chauhan, District Barmer.



10. Rupa Ram S/o Shri Likhama Ram, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Leelsar, Jasnath Nagar, Gram Panchayat, Pavariya Tala, Panchayat Samiti Chauhatan, District Barmer.
11. Harish S/o Shri Vabhuta Ram, Aged About 26 Years, Resident Of Budiyaon Ka Tala, Leelsar, Jasnath Nagar, Gram Panchayat, Pavariya Tala, Panchayat Samiti Chauhatan, District Barmer.
12. Dalveer S/o Shri Vabhuta Ram, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Budiyaon Ka Tala, Leelsar, Jasnath Nagar, Gram Panchayat, Pavariya Tala, Panchayat Samiti Chauhatan, District Barmer.

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Secretary To The Govt. And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Barmer.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Chouhtan, District Barmer.
5. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Chouhtan, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(121) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11075/2025

1. Gokal Ram S/o Shri Mukana Ram, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Guda Raikan, Tehsil Luni District Jodhpur.
2. Bhura Ram Choudhary S/o Shri Hukma Ram, Aged About 51 Years, Resident Of Guda Raikan, Tehsil Luni District Jodhpur.
3. Biram Ram S/o Shri Harji Ram, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Guda Raikan, Tehsil Luni District Jodhpur.
4. Hema Ram S/o Shri Sata Ram, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Guda Raikan, Tehsil Luni District Jodhpur.
5. Hukma Ram S/o Shri Jetha Ram, Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Guda Raikan, Tehsil Luni District Jodhpur.
6. Mangi Lal S/o Shri Hukma Ram, Aged About 62 Years,



Resident Of Guda Raikan, Tehsil Luni District Jodhpur.

7. Sela Ram S/o Shri Ananda Ram, Aged About 54 Years, Resident Of Guda Raikan, Tehsil Luni District Jodhpur.
8. Jala Ram S/o Shri Shiv Lal, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Guda Raikan, Tehsil Luni District Jodhpur.
9. Javari Lal S/o Shri Mangi Lal, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Guda Raikan, Tehsil Luni District Jodhpur.
10. Chena Ram S/o Shri Pema Ram, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Guda Raikan, Tehsil Luni District Jodhpur.
11. Jala Ram S/o Dhagla Ram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Guda Raikan, Tehsil Luni District Jodhpur.
12. Ashok S/o Shri Surja Ram, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Guda Raikan, Tehsil Luni District Jodhpur.
13. Sona Ram S/o Shri Pabu Ram, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Guda Raikan, Tehsil Luni District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jodhpur.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Luni District Jodhpur.
4. Tehsildar, Luni District Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(122) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11076/2025

1. Dinesh Kumar S/o Shri Jhunta Ram, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Saranpura, Gram Panchayat Rasal, Panchayat Samiti Kuchaman City, District Deedwana-Kuchaman.
2. Magna Ram S/o Shri Bhaira Ram, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Village Saranpura, Gram Panchayat Rasal, Panchayat Samiti Kuchaman City, District Deedwana-Kuchaman.
3. Khema Ram S/o Shri Prema Ram, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Saranpura, Gram Panchayat Rasal, Panchayat Samiti Kuchaman City, District Deedwana-Kuchaman.
4. Onkar Ram S/o Shri Rugha Ram, Aged About 30 Years,



Resident Of Village Saranpura, Gram Panchayat Rasal, Panchayat Samiti Kuchaman City, District Deedwana-Kuchaman.

5. Mula Ram S/o Shri Tiku Ram, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Village Saranpura, Gram Panchayat Rasal, Panchayat Samiti Kuchaman City, District Deedwana-Kuchaman.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur
2. Secretary To The Govt. And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur
3. District Collector, Deedwana-Kuchaman.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Kuchaman City, District Deedwana-Kuchaman.
5. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Kuchaman City, District Deedwana-Kuchaman.

-----Respondents


(123) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11077/2025

1. Jogendra Singh Sandhu S/o Shri Satnam Singh, Aged About 47 Years, Resident Of 4 Lc-A, Bugiya, Panchayat Samiti Sri Vijay Nagar, District Sri Ganganagar.
2. Rajveer Kaur W/o Shri Jogendra Singh, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of 4 Lc-A, Bugiya, Panchayat Samiti Sri Vijay Nagar, District Sri Ganganagar.
3. Deshraj S/o Shri Banwari Lal, Aged About 43 Years, Resident Of 4 Lc-A, Bugiya, Panchayat Samiti Sri Vijay Nagar, District Sri Ganganagar.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Secretary To The Govt. And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government



Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

3. District Collector, Sri Ganganagar.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Sri Vijay Nagar, District Sri Ganganagar.
5. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Sri Vijay Nagar, District Sri Ganganagar.

-----Respondents

(124) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11079/2025

1. Deda Ram S/o Shri Binja Ram, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Beniwalo Ki Dhani, Tehsil Khinvsar, District Nagaur.
2. Dalu Ram S/o Shri Dhana Ram, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Beniwalo Ki Dhani, Tehsil Khinvsar, District Nagaur.
3. Kheraj Ram S/o Shri Moti Ram, Aged About 74 Years, Resident Of Beniwalo Ki Dhani, Tehsil Khinvsar, District Nagaur.
4. Arjun Ram S/o Shri Ramu Ram, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Beniwalo Ki Dhani, Tehsil Khinvsar, District Nagaur.
5. Lalu Ram S/o Shri Moola Ram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Beniwalo Ki Dhani, Tehsil Khinvsar, District Nagaur.
6. Phusa Ram S/o Shri Prahlad Ram, Aged About 67 Years, Resident Of Beniwalo Ki Dhani, Tehsil Khinvsar, District Nagaur.
7. Jetha Ram S/o Shri Bhikha Ram, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Beniwalo Ki Dhani, Tehsil Khinvsar, District Nagaur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Nagaur.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Khinvsar, District Nagaur.
4. Tehsildar, Khinvsar, District Nagaur.

-----Respondents



(125) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11083/2025

Banka Ram S/o Poonama Ram, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Daukiyo Ki Beri Tehsil Nokhada, District Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

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

----Respondents

(126) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11087/2025

Mani Devi, Aged About 65 Years, Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Konara Vilavatshah, Panchayat Samiti Chohtan, District Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Chohtan, District Barmer.
4. Tehsildar, Chohtan, District Barmer.

----Respondents

(127) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11088/2025

1. Mangilal S/o Anopa Ram, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Bhimwas, Ramjan Ki Gafan, Tehsil Chouhtan, District Barmer.
2. Hiram Ram S/o Hamir Ram, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Bhimwas, Ramjan Ki Gafan, Tehsil Chouhtan, District Barmer.
3. Natha Ram S/o Parbha Ram, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Bhimwas, Ramjan Ki Gafan, Tehsil Chouhtan, District Barmer.
4. Achla Ram S/o Kishan Ram, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Bhimwas, Ramjan Ki Gafan, Tehsil Chouhtan, District Barmer.

----Petitioners



Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Chouhtan District Barmer.
4. Tehsildar, Chouhtan District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(128) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11089/2025

Yashpal Singh S/o Shri Mool Singh, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Bhutiya Bera, Mawri, Post Office Mawri, District Barmer.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Balotra.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Siwana, District Balotra.

-----Respondents


(129) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11090/2025

1. Sampat Gurjar S/o Chitar Gurjar, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Devpuriya, Jassu Ji Ka Kheda, Mandalgarh, Bhilwara.
2. Dutha Ram Gurjar S/o Bholu Ram Gurjar, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Devpuriya, Jassu Ji Ka Kheda, Mandalgarh, Bhilwara.
3. Prakash Gurjar S/o Foja Gurjar, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Devpuriya, Jassu Ji Ka Kheda, Mandalgarh, Bhilwara.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayatiraj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayatiraj, Secretariat, Jaipur.



3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Bhilwara.
4. District Collector, Bhilwara.
5. Sub Divisional Officer, Tehsil Mandalgarh, District Bhilwara.
6. Tehsildar, Tehsil Mangalgarh, District Bhilwara.

----Respondents

(130) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11092/2025

1. Chhotu Ram S/o Niku Ram, Aged About 65 Years, Ward No. 09, Ialanabas Sheopura, Hanumangarh, Raj.
2. Ram Swaroop Nain S/o Jagdish Prasad Nain, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Ward No. 09, Ialanabas Sheopura, Hanumangarh, Raj.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Hanumangarh.
3. The Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Hanumangarh.

----Respondents

(131) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11093/2025

1. Shankar Lal Banjara S/o Chanda Ji Banjara, Aged About 70 Years, R/o Salampura, Mandalgarh, Bhilwara.
2. Gopal Lal Banjara S/o Chitarmal Banjara, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Salampura, Mandalgarh, Bhilwara.
3. Uday Lal Gurjar S/o Chandra Ji Gurjar, Aged About 23 Years, R/o Salampura, Mandalgarh, Bhilwara.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayatiraj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayatiraj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Bhilwara.
4. District Collector, Bhilwara.



5. Sub Divisional Officer, Tehsil Mandalgarh, District Bhilwara.
6. Tehsildar, Tehsil Mangalgarh, District Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(132) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11094/2025

Rupa Ram S/o Kojaram, Aged About 70 Years, R/o Village And Post Ramnagar, Gram Panchayat Sonalpura, Tehsil Bap, District Phalodi.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Phalodi.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Tehsil Bap, District Phalodi.
4. Tehsildar (Land Record), Bap, Tehsil Bap, District Phalodi.
5. The Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Sonalpura, Panchayat Samiti Bap, District Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(133) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11095/2025

Mangi Lal S/o Shri Bharamala Ram, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Sarano Ki Dhani, Subhashnagar, Bheeyasar, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector, Phalodi, Rajasthan.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, District Phalodi, Rajasthan.
4. The Tehsildar, Ghantiyali, District Phalodi, Rajasthan.
5. The Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Bheeyasar, Panchayat Samiti Ghantiyali, District Phalodi, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(134) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11096/2025



1. Bheru Lal Gurjar S/o Jagrup Ji Gurjar, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Chawandiya, Jassu Ji Ka Kheda, Mandalgarh, Bhilwara.
2. Ratan Lal Gurjar S/o Bheru Lal Gurjar, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Chawandiya, Jassu Ji Ka Kheda, Mandalgarh, Bhilwara.
3. Durgesh Kumar Gurjar S/o Jagannath Gurjar, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Chawandiya, Jassu Ji Ka Kheda, Mandalgarh, Bhilwara.

-----Petitioners

Versus

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

-----Respondents

(135) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11100/2025

1. Deeparam Suthar S/o Shri Durga Ram Suthar, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Village Vishwakarma Nagar, Dablisara, Chawa, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
2. Sawai Ram S/o Shri Bala Ram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Vishwakarma Nagar, Dablisara, Chawa, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
3. Kheta Ram Suthar S/o Shri Naga Ram Suthar, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Vishwakarma Nagar, Dablisara, Chawa, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
4. Hukama Ram Suthar S/o Shri Khema Ram Suthar, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Vishwakarma Nagar, Dablisara, Chawa, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.



5. Kishana Ram S/o Shri Shera Ram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Vishwakarma Nagar, Dablisara, Chawa, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
6. Khuma Ram S/o Shri Raju Ram, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Village Vishwakarma Nagar, Dablisara, Chawa, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
7. Rekha Ram Choudhary S/o Shri Hukama Ram Choudhary, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Vishwakarma Nagar, Dablisara, Chawa, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Barmer.

-----Respondents

(136) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11102/2025

1. Bhura Ram S/o Shri Mangla Ram, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village Romoni Saran Nagar, Gram Panchayat Dablisara, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
2. Hema Ram S/o Shri Vagta Ram, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Village Romoni Saran Nagar, Gram Panchayat Dablisara, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
3. Talsa Ram S/o Shri Bhura Ram, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village Thoriyon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Dablisara, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
4. Lacha Ram S/o Shri Aanda Ram, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Thoriyon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Dablisara, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
5. Thakra Ram S/o Shri Khiyan Ram, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village Romoni Saran Nagar, Gram Panchayat Dablisara, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer,



Rajasthan.

6. Mukana Ram S/o Shri Teja Ram, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Village Bhagasar, Gram Panchayat Dablisara, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
7. Premraj S/o Shri Teja Ram, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village Bhagasar, Gram Panchayat Dablisara, Tehsil Barmer Rural, District Barmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Barmer.

-----Respondents

(137) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11106/2025

Laxman Ram S/o Modaji, Aged About 58 Years, R/o Village Balwantgarh (Padiv), Tehsil And District Sirohi (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

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

-----Respondents

(138) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11107/2025

1. Sawai Ram S/o Bhikha Ram, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Jambha Shakti Nagar, Mehwalo Ki Dhani, Raneri, District Phalodi, Rajasthan - 342301.
2. Bhajna Ram S/o Rugnath Ram, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Raneri, Tehsil Phalodi, District Phalodi, Rajasthan - 342301.
3. Dewa Ram, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Meghwalo Ki Dhani, Raneri, Jodhpur, Phalodi, District Phalodi, Rajasthan - 342301.



-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Phalodi.
3. Sdo, Bap, Phalodi.
4. Tehsildar, Bap, Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(139) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11109/2025

1. Gordhanram S/o Shri Nathuram, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village Sareli Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Sevenron Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balora, Rajasthan.
2. Hanuman S/o Shri Poonamaram, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Village And Gram Panchayat Sevenron Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balora, Rajasthan.
3. Sawlaram S/o Shri Damaram, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Severon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Sevenron Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balora, Rajasthan.
4. Jogaram S/o Shri Ladhuram, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Village Severon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Sevenron Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balora, Rajasthan.
5. Aaidan Singh S/o Narayanram, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Dhatarwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Sevenron Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balora, Rajasthan.
6. Gomaram S/o Khiyan Ram, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Dhatarwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Sevenron Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balora, Rajasthan.
7. Devaram S/o Dugaram, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Sareli Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Sevenron Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balora, Rajasthan.
8. Jogaram S/o Tikuram, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village Sareli Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Sevenron Ki Dhani,



Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balora, Rajasthan.

9. Shankarlal S/o Vagtaram, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Taterwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Sevenron Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balora, Rajasthan.
10. Chenaram S/o Shri Narayanram, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Village Dhatarwalo Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Sevenron Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balora, Rajasthan.
11. Hadmaanram S/o Shri Bhaganaram, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village And Gram Panchayat Sevenron Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balora, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayatiraj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Balotra.

-----Respondents

(140) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11112/2025

Jimaldeen S/o Ramdaan, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Gumaniya Ka Talan, Tehsil Chohtan, District Barmer (Raj.)

-----Petitioner


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Chohtan, District Barmer.
4. Tehsildar, Chohtan, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(141) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11113/2025

1. Kheraj Ram S/o Fusa Ram, Aged About 53 Years, R/o Village Bhakhari, District Barmer.



2. Heera Ram S/o Sanga Ram, Aged About 51 Years, R/o Village Moteesara, District Barmer.
3. Padma Ram S/o Bhera Ram, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Panyala Khurd, District Barmer.
4. Rama Ram S/o Taga Ram, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Village Bhakhari, District Barmer.
5. Bhana Ram S/o Sanga Ram, Aged About 64 Years, R/o Village Moteesara, District Barmer.
6. Chagana Ram S/o Pratapa Ram, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Gadesara, District Barmer.
7. Likhma Ram S/o Dalu Ram, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village Bhakhari, District Barmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Balota.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Barmer.

-----Respondents

(142) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11114/2025

Yakub S/o Jameel, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Jameelaniyon Ka Pada, Sanwa, Tehsil Dhanau, District Barmer.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Chohtan, District Barmer.
4. Tehsildar, Dhanau, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(143) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11117/2025

Suryaprakash S/o Prabhu Ram, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Bagani Sutharo Ki Dhani, Tehsil Nokhada, District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioner



Versus

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

-----Respondents

(144) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11118/2025

1. Sagar Khan S/o Safi Khan, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Imam Nagar Rabadiya, Tehsil Jhanwar, District Jodhpur (Raj.)
2. Salim Khan S/o Choge Khan, Aged About 64 Years, Resident Of Imam Nagar Rabadiya, Tehsil Jhanwar, District Jodhpur (Raj.)
3. Pape Khan S/o Safi Khan, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Imam Nagar Rabadiya, Tehsil Jhanwar, District Jodhpur (Raj.)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary To The Government, Department Of Panchayati Raj And Rural Development, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. District Collector, Jodhpur (Raj.)
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Looni, Jodhpur (Raj.)
4. Tehsildar, Jhanwar, District Jodhpur (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(145) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11145/2025

Smt. Rahimo W/o Shri Barkat Khan, Aged About 39 Years, Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Bandhewa, Tehsil Falsund, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Jodhpur.
3. The District Collector, Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
4. The S.d.o., Pokran, Rajasthan.



-----Respondents

(146) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11164/2025

1. Devi Singh S/o Shri Ram Narayan Singh, Aged About 49 Years, R/o Ganesh Colony Borawar, District Didwana-Kuchaman, Rajasthan.
2. Himmat Singh Rajpurohit S/o Shri Bhanwar Lal, Aged About 66 Years, R/o Borawar, District Didwana-Kuchaman, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. The District Collector, District Didwana-Kuchaman, Rajasthan.
4. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Makrana, District Didwana-Kuchaman, Rajasthan.
5. The Tehsildar, Tehsil Makrana, District Didwana-Kuchaman, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(147) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11166/2025

1. Dilip Singh S/o Shri Murar Dan Ji, Aged About 67 Years, R/o Shubh Sagar Krshi Farm, Narapada, Narpara, Jalore, Rajasthan.
2. Bhola Ram S/o Shri Adanaji, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Kumharo Ka Vas, Narpara, Jalore, Rajasthan.
3. Awardan S/o Shri Shambhudan Ji, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Narpara, Noon, Jalore, Rajasthan.
4. Murara Dan Charan S/o Shri Vaag Dan, Aged About 70 Years, R/o Charano Ka Vas, Narpara, Jalore, Rajasthan.
5. Pintu Singh S/o Shri Kant Dan, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Chamo Ka Vas, Narpada, Narpara, Jalore, Rajasthan.
6. Ganesha Ram S/o Shri Bhera Ram, Aged About 73



Years, R/o Kumharo Ka Vas, Narpara, Jalore, Rajasthan.

7. Mangi Lal S/o Shri Lala Ram, Aged About 67 Years, R/o Sargaron Ka Vas, Narpara, Noon, Jalore, Rajasthan.
8. Asha Ram S/o Shri Neti Ram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Rebariyo Ka Vas, Narpara, Jalore, Noon, Rajasthan.
9. Vagata Ram S/o Shri Asalaji, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Meghwalo Ka Vas, Narpara, Noon, Jalore, Rajasthan.
10. Jamata Ram S/o Shri Lalaji, Aged About 73 Years, R/o Sargaron Ka Vas, Narpara, Jalore, Rajasthan.
11. Paraga Ram S/o Shri Adana Ji, Aged About 55 Years, R/o 76, Kumahro Ka Vas, Narpara, Jalore, Noon, Rajasthan.
12. Jetha Ram S/o Shri Choga Ram, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Sutharo Ka Vas, Narpara, Jalore, Rajasthan.
13. Parabata Ram S/o Shri Suga Ram, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Narpara, Noon, Jalore, Rajasthan.
14. Kuya Ram S/o Shri Dhana Ram, Aged About 50 Years, R/o 38, Kumharo Ka Vas, Narpara, Jalore, Noon, Rajasthan.
15. Durga Dan S/o Shri Hamir Dan Ji, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Charano Ka Vas, Narpara, Jalore, Rajasthan.
16. Jagdish Singh S/o Shri Chhail Dan, Aged About 37 Years, R/o 22, Charno Ka Vas, Narpara, Jalore, Rajasthan.
17. Gepa Ram S/o Shri Punama Ram, Aged About 50 Years, R/o 149, Kumharo Ka Vas, Narpara, Jalore, Noon, Rajasthan.
18. Kana Ram S/o Shri Sava Ram, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Sargro Ka Vas, Narpara, Jalore, Noon, Rajasthan.
19. Lakha Ram S/o Shri Bhaga Ji, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Meghwalo Ka Vas, Narpara, Jalore, Noon, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur,



Rajasthan.

3. The District Collector, District Jalore, Rajasthan.
4. The Tehsildar, Tehsil Jalore, District Jalore, Rajasthan.
5. The Gram Panchayat Noon, Panchayati Samiti Jalore, District Jalore, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

(148) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11176/2025

Rajendra Amaliyar S/o Dubala Amaliyar, Aged About 40 Years,
R/o Rangi Ward No.08 Tambesara, Banswara, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Banswara (Raj.).
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Banswara.

----Respondents

(149) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11183/2025

Sohan Lal Jakhar S/o Shri Mangi Lal Jakhar, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Jakharo Ki Dhani, Narwa, Tehsil And District Jodhpur.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jodhpur.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Jodhpur North.
4. Tehsildar, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

(150) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11191/2025

Lahalram S/o Kisnaram, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Malam Singh Ki Sidh, Jodhpur, Rajasthan-342307.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary To The



Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj
Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

2. The District Collector, Phalodi.
3. Sdo, Bap, Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(151) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11194/2025

1. Rajendra Singh S/o Shri Durga Dan, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Jato Ka Bas, Village Khari Kallan, Tehsil Luni, District Jodhpur.
2. Hanuman Choyal S/o Shri Sukh Ram Choyal, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Jato Ka Bas, Village Khari Kallan, Tehsil Luni, District Jodhpur.
3. Suresh Choyal S/o Shri Bhanwar Lal Choyal, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Jato Ka Bas, Village Khari Kallan, Tehsil Luni, District Jodhpur.
4. Shrawan Badiyar S/o Shri Kana Ram Badiyar, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Jato Ka Bas, Village Khari Kallan, Tehsil Luni, District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jodhpur.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Luni District Jodhpur.
4. Tehsildar, Kuri District Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(152) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11195/2025

1. Sukt Ali S/o Mehardin, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Ismail Ki Dhani, Ajeeri, Nure Ki Bhurj, Jodhpur, Rajasthan - 342307.
2. Asagar Ali S/o Kayam Deen, Aged About 43 Years, Resident Of Kalukhan Ki Dhani, Ajeeri, Nure Ki Bhurj, Jodhpur, Rajasthan - 342307.
3. Mujibar S/o Imamdeen, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Nure Ki Bhurj, Jodhpur, Rajasthan - 342307.
4. Mohammad Jusaf S/o Yar Mohammad, Aged About 32



Years, Resident Of Ismail Ki Dhani, Ajeeri, Noore Ki Bhuj, Jodhpur, Phalodi, Rajasthan - 342307.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary To The Government, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Phalodi.
3. Sdo, Bap, Phalodi.
4. Tehsildar, Bap, Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(153) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11198/2025

Kesha Ram S/o Shri Kalla Ram, Aged About 77 Years, R/o Neembal Kot, Sindhari, District Barmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer (Raj.).
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Barmer.

-----Respondents

(154) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11205/2025

1. Ashok Singh S/o Chun Singh, Aged About 26 Years, R/o - Village - Devalgarh, Gram Panchayat - Tamlor, Tehsil - Gadra, Dist. Barmer.
2. Taneraj Singh S/o Riju Singh, Aged About 43 Years, R/o - Village - Devalgarh, Gram Panchayat - Tamlor, Tehsil - Gadra, Dist. Barmer.
3. Revant Singh S/o Shankar Singh, Aged About 28 Years, R/o - Village - Devalgarh, Gram Panchayat - Tamlor, Tehsil - Gadra, Dist. Barmer.
4. Chandra Singh S/o Bhanwar Singh, Aged About 68 Years, R/o - Village - Devalgarh, Gram Panchayat - Tamlor, Tehsil - Gadra, Dist. Barmer.
5. Jiwan Singh S/o Chain Singh, Aged About 30 Years, R/o - Village - Devalgarh, Gram Panchayat - Tamlor, Tehsil -



Gadra, Dist. Barmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur, (Raj.).
2. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Revenue Department, Jaipur (Raj.).
3. The District Collector, Barmer (Raj.).
4. Sub Divisional Collector, Barmer (Raj.).
5. Tehsildar, Tehsil Gadra Road, Barmer (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(155) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11206/2025

1. Anna Singh S/o Shri Nol Singh, Aged About 70 Years, Residents Of Village Dhardiya, Gram Panchayat Gyangarh, Tehsil Kareda, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
2. Shankar Singh S/o Shri Jairam Singh, Aged About 44 Years, Residents Of Village Dhardiya, Gram Panchayat Gyangarh, Tehsil Kareda, District Bhilwara (Raj.).

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector, Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(156) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11207/2025

1. Jai Singh S/o Shri Hem Singh, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Village Gorana, Gram Panchayat Gyan Garh, Tehsil Kareda, District Bhilwara (Raj.)
2. Madan Ram S/o Shri Pratap Ram, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Village Gorana, Gram Panchayat Gyan Garh,



Tehsil Kareda, District Bhilwara (Raj.)

3. Sohan Lal S/o Shri Dhanna Ji, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Village Gorana, Gram Panchayat Gyan Garh, Tehsil Kareda, District Bhilwara (Raj.)
4. Daya Ram S/o Shri Ashu Ji, Aged About 75 Years, Resident Of Village Gorana, Gram Panchayat Gyan Garh, Tehsil Kareda, District Bhilwara (Raj.)
5. Asu Ram S/o Shri Balu Ram, Aged About 31 Years, Resident Of Village Gorana, Gram Panchayat Gyan Garh, Tehsil Kareda, District Bhilwara (Raj.)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector, Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(157) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11209/2025

1. Megh Singh S/o Shri Hukum Singh, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Village Richhi Ka Badiya, Gram Panchayat Nareli, Tehsil Kareda, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
2. Tej Singh S/o Shri Bheru Singh, Aged About 73 Years, Resident Of Village Richhi Ka Badiya, Gram Panchayat Nareli, Tehsil Kareda, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
3. Hari Singh S/o Shri Bheru Singh, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Village Richhi Ka Badiya, Gram Panchayat Nareli, Tehsil Kareda, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
4. Teel Singh S/o Shri Sohan Singh, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Village Richhi Ka Badiya, Gram Panchayat Nareli, Tehsil Kareda, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
5. Roshan Lal S/o Shri Daya Ram, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Village Richhi Ka Badiya, Gram Panchayat Nareli, Tehsil Kareda, District Bhilwara (Raj.).



-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector, Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(158) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11215/2025

1. Neku Khan S/o Mr. Samaut Khan, Aged About 54 Years, R/o Village Meghawas, Tehsil Patodi, District Balotra.
2. Ibrahim Khan S/o Mr. Amin Khan, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Village Meghawas, Tehsil Patodi, District Balotra.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of Panchayatiraj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector, Balotra, Rajasthan.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Tehsil Patodi, District Balotra, Rajasthan.
4. Tehsildar, Tehsil Patodi, District Balotra.

-----Respondents


(159) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11219/2025

1. Asin Khan S/o Sheru Khan, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Badnawa, Charnan, Tehsil Patodi, District Balotra (Raj.).
2. Mile Khan S/o Aseen Khan, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Khanora, Tehsil Patodi, District Balotra (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Balotra (Raj.)



3. Panchayat Samiti Patodi, District Balotra Through Its Vikas Adhikari.

-----Respondents

(160) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11220/2025

1. Rajvinder Singh S/o Karnail Singh, Aged About 54 Years, Resident Of 19 Gb, Tehsil Vijaynagar, District Sri Ganganagar (Raj.).
2. Paramjeet Singh S/o Pritam Singh, Aged About 51 Years, Resident Of 19 Gb, Tehsil Vijaynagar, District Sri Ganganagar (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Sri Ganganagar (Raj.)
3. Sub Division Officer, Sri Vijaynagar, District Sri Ganganagar.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Sri Ganganagar.

-----Respondents

(161) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11221/2025

1. Jadhav Khan S/o Mohd. Khan, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Mangaliya Musalmano Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Mangta, District Barmer.
2. Kewa Ram, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Khardiya, Gram Panchayat Mangta, District Barmer.
3. Mewa Ram S/o Bhawra Ram, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Bhawraram Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Mangta, District Barmer.
4. Bhana Ram S/o Kheta Ram, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Village Bhawraram Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Mangta, District Barmer.
5. Jema Khan, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village Mangaliya Musalmano Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Mangta, District Barmer.
6. Hira Ram S/o Padma Ram, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Village Khardiya, Gram Panchayat Mangta, District Barmer.



-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Magistrate, Division Dhorimanna, District Barmer.
4. Village Development Officer, Tehsil Dhorimanna, District Barmer.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Barmer.
6. Tehsildar, Dhorimanna, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(162) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11224/2025

1. Devi Singh S/o Shri Guman Singh, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Village Muradava, Tehsil Sojat, District Pali.
2. Om Singh S/o Shri Nathu Singh, Aged About 54 Years, R/o Rajputo Ka Bas, Gura Bachraj, Tehsil Sojat, District Pali.
3. Pokar Ram Meghwal S/o Shri Khinva Ram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Meghwalon Ka Bas, Muradava, Tehsil Sojat, District Pali.
4. Ghanshyam Das Vaishnav S/o Shri Bhagwan Das, Aged About 49 Years, R/o Gura Bachraj, Tehsil Sojat, District Pali.
5. Bhura Ram Meghwal S/o Shri Durga Ram Meghwal, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Meghwalon Ka Bas, Muradava, Tehsil Sojat, District Pali.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Pali, Rajasthan.
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Pali.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Sojat, District Pali, Rajasthan.
5. Tehsildar Sojat, District Pali, Rajasthan.



-----Respondents

(163) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11226/2025

1. Sher Mohammad Khan S/o Dosu Khan, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Khokhariyo Ki Dhani, Nimba Nada, Tehsil Shiv, District Barmer.
2. Ramtala S/o Khuda Bax, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Nimba Nada, Tehsil Shiv, District Barmer.
3. Sidir Khan S/o Hamir Khan, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Nimba Nada, Tehsil Shiv, District Barmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Barmer.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Shiv, District - Barmer.
4. Tehsildar, Shiv, District - Barmer.

-----Respondents

(164) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11227/2025

Gram Panchayat Dhaysar, Panchayat Samiti Jaisalmer, District Jaisalmer. Through Its Ward Panch-

1. Kheta Am S/o Bhavru Ram, Age 45 Years,
 2. Narpat Ram S/o Rama Ram, Age 45 Years,
- Both R/o Village Jawandh Nai, Gram Panchayat Dhaisar, District Jaisalmer.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Jaisalmer.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Dhaysar, District Jaisalmer.
4. The Tehsildar, Dhaysar, District Jaisalmer.

-----Respondents

(165) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11231/2025

1. Ravata S/o Rekharam, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Dudhapur, Gram Panchayat Udasar, District Barmer.



2. Kailash Narayan S/o Khiyanram, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village Dudhapur, Gram Panchayat Udasar, District Barmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Magistrate, Division Dhorimanna, District Barmer.
4. Village Development Officer, Tehsil Dhorimanna, District Barmer.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Barmer.
6. Tehsildar, Dhorimanna, District Barmer

-----Respondents

(166) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11235/2025

1. Ganeshram S/o Shri Jaloo Ram, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village- Dalanara, Gram Panchayat- Nagarda, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
2. Jasraj S/o Shri Sonaram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village- Dalanara, Gram Panchayat- Nagarda, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
3. Sonaram S/o Shri Pemaram, Aged About 58 Years, R/o Village- Dalanara, Gram Panchayat- Nagarda, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
4. Magaram S/o Shri Pemaram, Aged About 51 Years, R/o Village- Dalanara, Gram Panchayat- Nagarda, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
5. Rahul Jani S/o Shri Jagmalram Jani, Aged About 58 Years, Dalanara, Gram Panchayat- Nagarda, District Barmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural



Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

3. District Collector, Barmer.

-----Respondents

(167) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11238/2025

1. Pushkar Raj Tosniwal S/o Ramdayal Tosniwal, Aged About 55 Years, Bachhkeda, Tehsil Shahpura, District Bhilwara, (Raj.).
2. Prabhat Goswami S/o Shiv Dayal Goswami, Aged About 45 Years, Bachhkeda, Tehsil Shahpura, District Bhilwara, (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan Secretariat, Jaipur, (Raj.).
2. Commissioner, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan Jaipur, (Raj.).
3. District Collector (Panchayat), Bhilwara, District Bhilwara, (Raj.).
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Bhilwara, District Bhilwara, (Raj.).

-----Respondents


(168) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11246/2025

1. Mala Ram S/o Shri Asu Ram Jakhar, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Hatundi, Baori, Jodhpur.
2. Pira Ram S/o Shri Rawat Ram, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Harkanada, Hatundi, Baori, Jodhpur.
3. Puna Ram S/o Shri Jetha Ram, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Harkanada, Hatundi, Baori, Jodhpur.
4. Bhera Ram S/o Shri Prahlad Ram, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Harkanada, Hatundi, Baori, Jodhpur.
5. Mota Ram S/o Shru Saval Ram, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Harkanada, Hatundi, Baori, Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And



Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.

2. Deputy Commissioner And Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(169) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11247/2025

1. Surendrapal Singh S/o Shri Kalyan Singh, Aged About 64 Years, R/o Maloonga, Tinwari, Jodhpur.
2. Joga Ram S/o Shri Tiku Ram, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Maloonga, Tinwari, Jodhpur.
3. Mula Ram Choudhary S/o Shri Nimba Ram, Aged About 37 Years, R/o 257, Maloonga, Tinwari, Jodhpur.
4. Kena Ram S/o Shri Bhura Ram, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Maloonga, Tinwari, Jodhpur.
5. Mahendra S/o Shri Sona Ram, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Maloonga, Tinwari, Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Deputy Commissioner And Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Jodhpur

-----Respondents

(170) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11249/2025

1. Prahlad Ram S/o Dhana Ram, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Villager Karanpura New Revenue Village Shree Ramsneh Singh Mukan Nagar, Gram Panchayat Wakapura, Tehsil And District Barmer.
2. Rawata Ram, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Villager Karanpura New Revenue Village Shree Ramsneh Singh Mukan Nagar, Gram Panchayat Wakapura, Tehsil And District Barmer.
3. Ashuram S/o Bhima Ram, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of New Revenue Village Bishanpura, Gram



Panchayat Wakapura, Tehsil And District Barmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The District Collector, Barmer (Raj.).
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Barmer (Raj.).
4. Tehsildar, Barmer District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(171) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11253/2025

Thana Ram S/o Shri Choga Ram, Aged About 70 Years, R/o 37, Vishnoiyan Ka Vas, Dhawa, Tehsil Luni, District Jodhpur (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jodhpur (Raj.).
3. Sub Division Officer, Luni, District Jodhpur.
4. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Jodhpur.

-----Respondents


(172) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11260/2025

1. Sumera Ram S/o Shri Bhaga Ram, Aged About 59 Years, R/o 95, Maliyon Ki Dhani, Dedipanada, Beru, Jodhpur
2. Bhagirath Choudhary S/o Shri Bhanwara Ram, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Jato Ki Dhaniya, Beru, Jodhpur
3. Gepar Ram S/o Shri Kishana Ram, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Dedipanada, Beru, Jodhpur
4. Pukh Raj S/o Shri Gopa Ram, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Dedipanada, Beru, Jodhpur
5. Hari Ram Saran S/o Shri Khiya Ram, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Dedipanada, Beru, Jodhpur

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary And



Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.

2. Deputy Commissioner And Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Jodhpur

-----Respondents

(173) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11270/2025

Abhishek Inani S/o Shri Babu Lal Inani, Aged About 28 Years, Resident Of Sallera Kallan, Post Sallera Kallan, Tehsil Mawali, District Udaipur (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Udaipur, Collectorate, Udaipur.
3. Tehsildar, Mawli, District Udaipur.

-----Respondents

(174) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11271/2025

Bholi Ram Dangi S/o Shri Gamana Dangi, Aged About 43 Years, Resident Of Bhimal Charnan, Post Sallera Kallan, Tehsil Mawali, District Udaipur (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Udaipur, Collectorate, Udaipur.
3. Tehsildar, Mawli, District Udaipur.

-----Respondents

(175) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11272/2025

Mahendra Singh Ranawat S/o Shri Devi Singh Ranawat, Aged About 41 Years, Resident Of Suvavton Ka Guda, Post Sallera Kallan, Tehsil Mawali, District Udaipur (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus



1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Udaipur, Collectorate, Udaipur.
3. Tehsildar, Mawli, District Udaipur.
4. Tehsildar Ghasa, District Udaipur.

-----Respondents

(176) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11290/2025

Krishan Kumar S/o Shri Kashi Ram, Aged About 45 Years,
Resident Of Village Gulpura, Tehsil Rajgarh District Churu.

-----Petitioner

Versus

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

-----Respondents

(177) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11291/2025

1. Sohan Lal Muhal S/o Shri Guman Ram Muhal, Aged About 61 Years, Resident Of Village Likhamasar, Ranasar, Panchayat Samiti Kuchaman City, District Deedwana-Kuchaman.
2. Hari Ram S/o Shri Panna Ram, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Village Likhamasar, Ranasar, Panchayat Samiti Kuchaman City, District Deedwana-Kuchaman.
3. Omprakash S/o Shri Hanumana Ram, Aged About 41 Years, Resident Of Village Likhamasar, Ranasar, Panchayat Samiti Kuchaman City, District Deedwana-Kuchaman.
4. Nand Lal S/o Shri Panna Das, Aged About 56 Years, Resident Of Village Likhamasar, Ranasar, Panchayat Samiti Kuchaman City, District Deedwana-Kuchaman.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary,



Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj,
Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

2. Secretary To The Govt. And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Deedwana-Kuchaman.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Kuchaman City, District Deedwana-Kuchaman.
5. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Kuchaman City, District Deedwana-Kuchaman.

-----Respondents

(178) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11299/2025

1. Tulsi Ram S/o Shri Uda Ram, Aged About 69 Years, Resident Of Village Derwa, Po Khari Karmsota, District Nagaur, Rajasthan.
2. Mansukh Ram S/o Shri Khinya Ram, Aged About 37 Years, Resident Of Village Derwa, District Nagaur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of Panchyat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. District Collector, Nagaur, Rajasthan.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Nagaur, District Nagaur, Rajasthan.
4. The Tehsildar Nagaur, District Nagaur, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents


(179) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11303/2025

1. Setha Ram S/o Shri Ganga Ram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Meghwalo Ki Dhaniya, Jetiyawas, Baori, Jodhpur
2. Kisana Ram S/o Shri Mangi Lal, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Meghwalo Ki Dhaniya, Jetiyawas, Baori, Jodhpur

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.



2. Deputy Commissioner And Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Jodhpur

-----Respondents

(180) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11305/2025

1. Mangla Ram S/o Shri Hanuman Ram, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Aajad Nagar, Gram Panchayat - Netrad, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
2. Mala Ram Choudhary S/o Shri Dhana Ram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Village Aajad Nagar, Gram Panchayat - Netrad, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
3. Govind Singh S/o Shri Umaram, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Village Doultoni Godarou Ka Tala, Gram Panchayat Gram Panchayat - Netrad, District Barmer, Rajasthan.
4. Ramlal S/o Shri Thanaram, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village - Doultoni Godarou Ka Tala, Gram Panchayat Gram Panchayat - Netrad, District Barmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Barmer.

-----Respondents


(181) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11310/2025

1. Nishar Mohammad S/o Shri Sabudin Mohammad, Aged About 36 Years, R/o 100, Teliyo Ka Bas, Dhanari Kalan, Baori, Jodhpur.
2. Naga Ram Choudhary S/o Shri Ramu Ram Choudhary, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Dhanari Kalan, Baori, Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.



2. Deputy Commissioner And Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Jodhpur.

----Respondents

(182) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11314/2025

Arjun Ram S/o Amra Ram, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Shobhala Jaitmal Tehsil Chohtan, District Barmer (Raj.)

----Petitioner

Versus

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

----Respondents


(183) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11318/2025

1. Likhma Ram S/o Mala Ram, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Village Khirjan Khas, Tehsil Shergarh, District Jodhpur (Raj.).
2. Kana Ram S/o Hamira Ram, Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Village Khirjan Khas, Tehsil Shergarh, District Jodhpur (Raj.).
3. Hari Singh Rathore S/o Udai Singh, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Village Khirjan Khas, Tehsil Shergarh, District Jodhpur (Raj.).
4. Mohan Singh S/o Gaje Singh, Aged About 72 Years, Resident Of Village Khirjan Khas, Tehsil Shergarh, District Jodhpur (Raj.).

----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The District Collector, Jodhpur.



4. The Sub Divisional Officer, Shergarh, District Jodhpur.
5. The Tehsildar Shergarh, District Jodhpur.
6. The Gram Panchayat Khirjan Khas, District Jodhpur, Through Its Village Development Officer
7. The Gram Panchayat Khirjan Khas, District Jodhpur, Through Its Patwari Khirjan Khas.
8. The Gram Panchayat Khirjan Khas, District Jodhpur, Through Its Sarpanch Khirjan Khas.
9. The Gram Panchayat Khirjan Khas, District Jodhpur, Through Its Former Sarpanch Khirjan Khas.
10. The Gram Panchayat Khirjan Khas, District Jodhpur, Through Its Ward Panch Khirjan Khas.

-----Respondents

(184) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11387/2025

Pawan Pareek S/o Ganga Vishan, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Jhalani Ki Gali, Hati Chowk, Nagaur (Ward No. 23) (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur (Rajasthan).
2. Director Cum Special Secretary, Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Nagaur.
4. Municipal Council, Nagaur, Through Its Commissioner.

-----Respondents

(185) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11408/2025

1. Govind Singh S/o Shri Hira Singh, Aged About 53 Years, R/o Village Undawasan, District Rajsamand (Raj.).
2. Dhanna Singh S/o Shri Ratan Singh, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Village Undawasan, District Rajsamand (Raj.).
3. Hira Singh S/o Shri Bhan Singh, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Undawasan, District Rajsamand (Raj.).
4. Poovar Minaxikumari Mahendrasinh W/o Shri Madan Singh, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Village Undawasan, District Rajsamand (Raj.).



-----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, Rajsamand (Raj.).
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Rajsamand (Raj.).
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sub-Division Bhim, District Rajsamand (Raj.).
7. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sub-Division Devgarh, District Rajsamand (Raj.).
8. The Tehsil Dar, Tehsil Bhim, District Rajsamand (Raj.).
9. The Tehsil Dar, Tehsil Devgarh, District Rajsamand (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(186) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11416/2025

Jagdish Chandra Jaat S/o Ram Bux Jaat, Aged About 63 Years,
R/o Samri, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan.


-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Chittorgarh, Rajasthan.
3. The Gram Panchayat Samri, Through Its Secretary, District Chittorgarh, Rajasthan.
4. The Gram Panchayat Sindhvadi, Through Its Secretary, District Chittorgarh, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(187) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11454/2025



1. Ayuwan Singh Shekhawat S/o Late Ganpat Singh, Aged About 67 Years, Resident Of Villager Hudeel, Tehsil Kuchaman City, District Deedwana Kuchaman (Rajasthan).
2. Ranveer Singh Shekhawat S/o Late Richhpal Singh Shekhawat, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Villager Hudeel, Tehsil Kuchaman City, District Deedwana Kuchaman (Rajasthan).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Rajasthan).
2. The District Collector, District Deedwana Kuchaman (Rajasthan).
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Kuchaman City, District Deedwana Kuchaman (Rajasthan).
4. The Tehsildar, Kuchaman City, District Deedwana Kuchaman (Rajasthan).

-----Respondents

(188) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11489/2025

1. Bheru Lal Jat S/o Mangi Lal Jat, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Kapadiya Khera, Gram Panchayat Bawalas, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.)
2. Rameshwar Lal Jat S/o Sohan Lal, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Village Kapadiya Khera, Gram Panchayat Bawalas, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.)
3. Bhanwar Lal Gadari S/o Pratap Ji, Aged About 56 Years, R/o Village Kapadiya Khera, Gram Panchayat Bawalas, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.)
4. Ram Prasad S/o Nand Ram, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Kapadiya Khera, Gram Panchayat Bawalas, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Government Of



Rajasthan, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj
Department, Secretariat, Jaipur

3. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector, Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(189) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11490/2025

1. Roshan Vyas S/o Shri Banshi Lal Vyas, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Kundal, Tehsil And District Phalodi.
2. Madhusudan S/o Shri Liladhar Vyas, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Chandon Ki Dhani, Village Kundal, Tehsil And District Phalodi.
3. Kailash Vyas S/o Shri Shivbagas Vyas, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Village Kundal, Tehsil And District Phalodi.
4. Jhawari Lal S/o Shri Puran Prakash Purohit, Aged About 51 Years, Resident Of Village Kundal, Tehsil And District Phalodi.
5. Rajesh Kumar S/o Shri Anna Ram, Aged About 29 Years, Resident Of Maliyon Ki Dhaniya, Sadawata, Village Kundal, Tehsil And District Phalodi.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Phalodi, Distt. Phalodi.
3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Phalodi, Distt. Phalodi.
4. Tehsildar, Phalodi, District Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(190) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11493/2025

Peera Ram S/o Dalu Ram, Aged About 47 Years, Hukmaniyon Kothon Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Malpura, District Barmer (Raj.)

-----Petitioner



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

-----Respondents

(191) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11497/2025

1. Bhairu Singh Rathore S/o Bhanwar Singh, Aged About 61 Years, Village 102, Rajputo Ki Dhani Mithiyasara, Baytu, Panwara, District Barmer (Rajasthan).
2. Shravan Singh Mahecha S/o Ram Singh, Aged About 26 Years, 104, Rajputo Ki Dhani Mithiyasara, Baytu, Panwara, District Barmer (Rajasthan).
3. Kheta Ram S/o Bija Ram, Aged About 43 Years, Village Mithiyasara, Baytu, Panwara, District Barmer (Rajasthan).
4. Hanuman Ram S/o Gumna Ram, Aged About 49 Years, Mudho Ki Dhani Mithiyasara, Baytu, Panwara, District Barmer (Rajasthan).
5. Pabu Ram S/o Surta Ram, Aged About 47 Years, Village Mithiyasara, Baytu, Panwara, District Barmer (Rajasthan).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Rajasthan).
2. The District Collector, District Balotra (Rajasthan)
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Baytu, District Balotra (Rajasthan).
4. The Tehsildar Baytu, District Balotra (Rajasthan).

-----Respondents

(192) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11500/2025

1. Mohan Lal S/o Joga Ram, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Banta Der, Banta, Gudamalani, District- Barmer (Raj.).
2. Nanga Ram S/o Kheta Ram, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Banta Der, Banta, Gudamalani, District-



Barmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panachayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Barmer.

-----Respondents

(193) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11503/2025

1. Karan Singh S/o Late Sh. Pratap Singh, Aged About 57 Years, Resident Of Village Malpura, Gram Panchayat Ummedpur, Tehsil Aahore, District Jalore (Raj.).
2. Peer Singh S/o Sh. Jagmal Singh, Aged About 47 Years, Resident Of Village Malpura, Gram Panchayat Ummedpur, Tehsil Aahore, District Jalore (Raj.).
3. Babu Lal S/o Sh. Narsa Ram, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Malpura, Gram Panchayat Ummedpur, Tehsil Aahore, District Jalore (Raj.).
4. Nathu Ram S/o Sh. Lumba Ram, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Village Malpura, Gram Panchayat Ummedpur, Tehsil Aahore, District Jalore (Raj.).
5. Mula Ram S/o Sh. Vada Ram, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Village Malpura, Gram Panchayat Ummedpur, Tehsil Aahore, District Jalore (Raj.).
6. Kanhiya Lal S/o Sh. Mula Ram, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Village Malpura, Gram Panchayat Ummedpur, Tehsil Aahore, District Jalore (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The District Collector, District Jalore (Raj.).
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Aahore, District Jalore (Raj.).
4. Tehsildar, Tehsil Aahore, District Jalore (Raj.).

-----Respondents



(194) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11504/2025

Yaar Mohammad S/o Ismail Khan, Aged About 35 Years, R/o 1,
Abdul Ki Dhani, Siyalon Ki Basti, Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. Deputy Commissioner And Deputy Secretary (First), Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
3. District Collector, Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
5. Tehsildar, Sam, Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.

----Respondents

(195) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11510/2025

1. Raghvendra Singh Rathore S/o Gopal Singh, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village Kodi Chaupawatan, Tehsil Raniwara, District Jalore.
2. Shankar Lal Purohit S/o Sava Ram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Alri, Tehsil Raniwada, District Jalore.
3. Ganesha Ram S/o Sona Ram, Aged About 68 Years, R/o Village Alri, Tehsil Raniwara, District Jalore.
4. Bhagwana Ram S/o Aba Ram, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village Alri, Tehsil Raniwara, District Jalore.
5. Samela Ram S/o Ranchoda Ram, Aged About 53 Years, R/o Village Alri, Tehsil Raniwara, District Jalore.
6. Suresh Kumar S/o Ramesh Kumar, Aged About 27 Years, Chapawatan, Tehsil Raniwara, District Jalore.
7. Badri Das S/o Santos Das, Aged About 57 Years, Kodi Chapawatan, Tehsil Raniwara, District Jalore.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat,



Jaipur, Rajasthan.

2. District Collector, Jalore.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Bhinmal, District Jalore.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Raniwara, District Jalore

-----Respondents

(196) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11512/2025

1. Mahesh Chandra Jat S/o Shri Kanhaiya Lal Jat, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Gadi Mohalla, Paltan, Ward 11, Varmandal, District- Pratapgarh (Rajasthan).
2. Kanwar Lal Gayari S/o Shri Ramratan Gayari, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Gayari Mohalla, Paltan, Ward 11, Varmandal, District- Pratapgarh (Rajasthan).
3. Dinesh Chandra Jat S/o Shri Bhanwar Lal Jat, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Gadi Mohalla, Paltan, District- Pratapgarh (Rajasthan).

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue (Gr-I), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Rajasthan).
2. Dy. Secretary, Department Of Revenue (Gr-I), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Rajasthan).
3. Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Rajasthan).
4. The District Collector (Land Revenue), Pratapgarh (Rajasthan).

-----Respondents

(197) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11516/2025

1. Purshotam Sharma S/o Hansraj Sharma, Aged About 67 Years, R/o Basant Vihar Colony, Chak 1-B-Chhoti, Near Tean Puli, Sri Ganganagar (Raj.).
2. Surendra Pal Singh S/o Gurudyal Singh, Aged About 68 Years, R/o Basant Vihar Colony, Chak 1-B-Chhoti, Near Tean Puli, Sri Ganganagar (Raj.).
3. Indrapal Singh S/o Harbansh Singh, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Basant Vihar Colony, Chak 1-B-Chhoti, Near



Tean Puli, Sri Ganganagar (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Local Self Department, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Rajasthan State, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Secretary, Urban Development And Housing Department, Rajasthan State, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. District Collector, Sri Ganganagar.
5. Commissioner, Municipal Council Sri Ganganagar (Raj.).
6. Gram Panchayat 4-Zed, Through Its Secretary Tahsil And District Sri Ganganagar (Raj.).

-----Respondents


(198) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11517/2025

1. Radha Kishan S/o Shri Tola Ram, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Mangra 1, Maliyon Ka Bera, Beru, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
2. Radha W/o Late Shri Rajesh, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Veeram Nagar, Beru, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
3. Bhagirath S/o Shri Pabu Ram, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Magra Wali Dhaniya, Beru, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
4. Chutra Ram, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Vishnoiyan Ki Dhaniya, Beru, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
5. Manohar Ram S/o Shri Jhumar Lal, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Magro Wali Dhaniya, Beru, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
6. Prema Ram Bhati S/o Shri Sona Ram, Aged About 66 Years, R/o Maliyon Ki Dhani, Beru, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
7. Bhabhut Ram S/o Shri Radhakishan, Aged About 70 Years, R/o Magro Wali Dhaniya, Beru, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
8. Mala Ram S/o Shri Hanuman Ram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Vishnoi Ki Dhaniya, Beru, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary And



Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.

2. Deputy Commissioner And Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(199) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11560/2025

Sukhram Bheel S/o Shri Heeraram Bheel, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Ambedkar Nagar, Shree Surpura, Malamsingh Ki Sidh, Phalodi (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Phalodi, District Phalodi.
3. The Sub Division Officer, Sub Division Baap, District Phalodi.
4. The Additional Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Phalodi, District Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(200) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11578/2025

1. Tara Ram S/o Amba Ram, Aged About 37 Years, Village Sawau Padamsingh, Darjiyo Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Gida, District Balotra.
2. Naga Ram S/o Khivra Ram, Aged About 55 Years, Village Sawau Padamsingh, Ramdaniyo Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Gida, District Balotra.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur
2. Secretary, Revenue Department, Jaipur
3. District Collector, Balotra.
4. Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Division Bayetu District



Barmer.

5. Village Development Officer, Tehsil Gida, District Balotra.
6. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Balotra.
7. Tehsildar, Gida, District Balotra
8. Patwari Gida, District Balotra.

-----Respondents

(201) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11579/2025

Kabool S/o Haja, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Ajbani, Boothia, Tehsil Ramsar, District Barmer.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Officer Ramsar, District Barmer.
4. Tehsildar Ramsar, District Barmer.

-----Respondents


(202) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11585/2025

1. Madhu Dan S/o Girdhari Dan, Aged About 56 Years, R/o Village Ratkuriya, Gram Panchayat Aarang, Tehsil Shiv, District Barmer. (Rajasthan) For All Villager Of Ratkuriya, Gram Panchayat Aarang, Tehsil Shiv, District Barmer. (Rajasthan).
2. Revata Ram S/o Chena Ram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Ratkuriya, Gram Panchayat Aarang, Tehsil Shiv, District Barmer. (Rajasthan) For All Villager Of Ratkuriya, Gram Panchayat Aarang, Tehsil Shiv, District Barmer. (Rajasthan).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary And Commissioner, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan Jaipur (Raj.)
2. Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur Through Additional Chief Secretary.



3. The District Collector, Barmer (Raj.)
4. The Sub Divisional Officer Shiv, District Barmer.
5. The Tehsildar Shiv, District Barmer (Raj.).
6. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Shiv, District Barmer (Raj.).
7. The Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Shiv, District Barmer (Raj.)

-----Respondents

(203) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11608/2025

1. Kumbha Ram S/o Hara Ram, Aged About 70 Years, Naharo Ki Dhani, Rohilla Kala, District Jodhpur (Raj.)
2. Prabhu Ram S/o Poona Ram, Aged About 62 Years, Naharo Ki Dhani, Rohilla Kala, District Jodhpur (Raj.)
3. Narpatt Singh S/o Sohan Singh, Aged About 61 Years, Rajputon Ka Baas, Rohilla Kala, District Jodhpur (Raj.)
4. Shakur Khan S/o Jamaal Khan, Aged About 68 Years, Rohilla Kala, Jhanwar, District Jodhpur (Raj.)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jodhpur
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(204) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11613/2025

Rukhamna Ram S/o Hanuman, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Hanumanpura, Jaisar, Barmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur, (Raj.).
2. The District Collector, Barmer (Raj.).
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Barmer (Raj.).
4. Tehsildar, Chohtan, Barmer, (Raj.).



-----Respondents

(205) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11615/2025

1. Adu Ram S/o Shri Labhu Ram, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Aakli, Bor Charnan, Gudamalani, District Barmer.
2. Ummeda Ram S/o Shri Labhu Ram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Aakli, Bor Charnan, Gudamalani, District Barmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Barmer.

-----Respondents

(206) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11620/2025

Bharat Kumar S/o Shri Motaram, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Village Hanuman Nagar, Gram Panchayat Kesumbla Bhatiyani, Panchayat Samiti- Gida, District- Balotra (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. District Collector, Balotra, Rajasthan.
3. Sub Division Officer, Bayatu, Rajasthan.
4. Tehsildar, Gira District- Balotra, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents


(207) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11622/2025

Purkha Ram S/o Shri Anada Ram, Aged About 67 Years, Resident Of 29, Siyalo Ki Shani, Bhojasar, Barmer.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.



2. The District Collector, Balotra.

----Respondents

(208) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11639/2025

Chetan Ram S/o Virdha Ram, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Village Kundanpura, Tehsil Sedwa, District Barmer.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Officer Sedwa, District Barmer.
4. Tehsildar Sedwa, District Barmer.

----Respondents

(209) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11647/2025

Dev Raj Choudhary S/o Joga Ram Choudhary, Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Villae Gangavas, Hudo Ki Dhani Tehsil Batadu, District Barmer, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, District Barmer.
4. Tehsildar, District Barmer.

----Respondents


(210) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11648/2025

Mana Ram Prajapat S/o Goradhan Ram, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Jugtani Kumbharon Ki Dhani, Chohtan, Barmer (Raj.).

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The District Collector, Barmer (Raj.).



3. Sub Divisional Officer, Barmer (Raj.).
4. Tehsildar, Chohtan, Barmer (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(211) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11654/2025

1. Rajendra Prasad Jat S/o Mangi Lal Jat, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Nahargarh, Gram Panchayat Leshawa, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.)
2. Sukhdev Kharol S/o Hajari Ji, Aged About 59 Years, R/o Village Nahargarh, Gram Panchayat Leshawa, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.)
3. Hansraj Jat S/o Bholu Ram, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Nahargarh, Gram Panchayat Leshawa, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.)
4. Leharu Jat S/o Amarchand, Aged About 76 Years, R/o Village Nahargarh, Gram Panchayat Leshawa, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.)
5. Kishan Lal Jat S/o Bagtawar Ji, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Village Nahargarh, Gram Panchayat Leshawa, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.)
6. Rameshwar Lal Jat S/o Heera Lal, Aged About 74 Years, R/o Village Nahargarh, Gram Panchayat Leshawa, Tehsil Mandal, District Bhilwara (Raj.)

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector, Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(212) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11655/2025

Bhagchand Kumawat S/o Manghu Kumawat, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Nayako Ka Mohalla, Naysa Talab, Shambhoopura District Bhilwara, Raj.



----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Bhilwara.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Shahpura, District Bhilwara.
4. Tehsildar, Shahpura, District Bhilwara.

----Respondents

(213) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11690/2025

Naina Ram S/o Shriramji, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village Kumharon Ki Dhani, Post Khichadon Ki Dhani, Tehsil Dhorimanna Dist. Barmer.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Revenue Department (Group-1), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Secretary, Panchayati Raj And Rural Development, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
3. The District Collector, Barmer.
4. The Sub Division Officer, Dhorimanna, Dist. Barmer.

----Respondents


(214) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11700/2025

1. Narnaram S/o Gumnaram, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Mithi, Gram Panchayat Kotla, District Barmer.
2. Chann Singh S/o Bagat Singh, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Adarsh Mithi, Gram Panchayat Kotla, District Barmer.

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Division Dhorimanna, District Barmer.



4. Village Development Officer, Tehsil Dhorimanna, District Barmer.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Barmer.
6. Tehsildar, Dhorimanna, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(215) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11702/2025

1. Bhoma Ram S/o Shri Tiku Ram, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Village Ratianada, Tehsil Bhaniyana, District Jaisalmer.
2. Natha Ram S/o Shri Nimba Ram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Ratianada, Tehsil Bhaniyana, District Jaisalmer.
3. Aadu Ram S/o Shri Rana Ram, Aged About 30 Years, Resident Of Village Ratianada, Tehsil Bhaniyana, District Jaisalmer.
4. Harkha Ram S/o Shri Rana Ram, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Moolasar, Tehsil Bhaniyana, District Jaisalmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Government Of Rajasthan, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The Principal Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector, Jaisalmer.

-----Respondents

(216) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11705/2025

1. Ramful Gurjar S/o Bhuvana Gurjar, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Devra, Tehsil Jahajpura, District Bhilwara (Raj.).
2. Gopal Gurjar S/o Chhotu Lal Gurjar, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Mandachar, Tehsil Jahajpura, District Bhilwara (Raj.).

-----Petitioners



Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary And Commissioner (Panchayati Raj Department), Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector Bhilwara, Having Its Office At Tehsil And District Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(217) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11732/2025

1. Sohan Lal S/o Shri Uda Ram, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Rajala, Tehsil Lohawat District Phalodi.
2. Kanwar Lal S/o Shri Bagdu Ram, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Rajala, Tehsil Lohawat District Phalodi.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Phalodi.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Lohawat District Phalodi.
4. Tehsildar, Lohawat, District Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(218) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11744/2025

Kewal Das S/o Bhanwar Das, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Village Dharmsar, Gram Panchayat Ghadoi Charnan, Panchayat Samiti Kalyanpur, District Balotra.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayati Raj And Rural Development Department, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Balotra.
3. Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Kalyanpur, District Balotra.
4. Tehsildar, Kalyanpur, District Balotra.

-----Respondents

(219) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11752/2025



1. Vikram Singh S/o Balvinder Singh, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Village 5 8A, Gram Panchayat 2 Pgmb, District Sri Ganganagar.
2. Nanu Ram S/o Bijha Ram, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Village 5 8A, Gram Panchayat 2 Pgmb, District Sri Ganganagar.
3. Kumbha Ram S/o Mula Ram, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Village 5 8A, Gram Panchayat 2 Pgmb, District Sri Ganganagar.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of The Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Sri Ganganagar.
3. Sub-Divisional Officer Anoopgarh, District Sri Ganganagar.
4. Tehsildar Anoopgarh, District Sri Ganganagar.
5. Vikash Adhikari, Panchayat Samiti Anoopgarh, District Sri Ganganagar.

-----Respondents

(220) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11758/2025

1. Nathu Lal Meena S/o Shri Bhaguta Ram Meena, Aged About 50 Years, Resident Of Meena Mohalla, Rajwas, Amalda, Tehsil Jahazpur, District Bhilwara, Rajasthan - 311605.
2. Ladu Lal Dhakar S/o Shri Radhakishan Dhakar, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Devnarayan Mohalla, Rajwas, Amalda, Tehsil Jahazpur, District Bhilwara, Rajasthan - 311605.
3. Bheru Lal Dhakar S/o Shri Lal Dhakar, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Mandapiya Village, Amalda, Tehsil Jahazpur, District Bhilwara, Rajasthan - 311605.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector (Panchayat), District Bhilwara,



Rajasthan.

3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Jahazpur, District Bhilwara, Rajasthan.
4. The Tehsildar, Jahazpur, District Bhilwara, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(221) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11764/2025

1. Rameshwar Prasad Sharma S/o Ram Lal Sharma, Aged About 64 Years, R/o Charbhujia Mandir Gali, Jainagar, Tehsil Antali, Dist. Bhilwara.
2. Ajay Kumar S/o Tulsi Ram Sharma, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Brahmano Ka Bas, Jainagar, Tehsil Antali, Dist. Bhilwara.
3. Ghanshyam Sharma S/o Badrilal Sharma, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village Jainagar, Tehsil Antali, Dist. Bhilwara.
4. Ashok Kumar Mali S/o Madhu Lal Mali, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Ward No. 9, Near Devnarayan Temple, Jainagar, Sambhugarh, Dist. Bhilwara.
5. Pokar S/o Juwara Gurjar, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Gajsinghpura, Dist. Bhilwara.
6. Rampal S/o Tulsi Ram Balai, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village Gajsinghpura, Dist. Bhilwara.
7. Sanwarmal S/o Kundanmal Balai, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Gajsinghpura, Dist. Bhilwara.
8. Premchand Regar S/o Krishna Regar, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Gajsinghpura, Dist. Bhilwara.
9. Smt. Kanta Sharma W/o Sampat Lal Sharma, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Jainagar, Dist. Bhilwara.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Bhilwara.
3. The Sub Division Officer, Gulabpura, Dist. Bhilwara
4. The Tehsildar, Tehsil Antali, Dist. Bhilwara.

-----Respondents



(222) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11771/2025

1. Pyare Khan S/o Sode Khan, Aged About 35 Years, Village Lakhmano Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Turkee Ki Basti, Panchayat Samiti Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
2. Nagar Khan S/o Ishe Khan, Aged About 51 Years, Village Lakhmano Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Turkee Ki Basti, Panchayat Samiti Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
3. Jalal Khan S/o Gomad Khan, Aged About 48 Years, Village Lakhmano Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Turkee Ki Basti, Panchayat Samiti Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
4. Roshan S/o Dayam, Aged About 26 Years, Village Lakhmano Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Turkee Ki Basti, Panchayat Samiti Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
5. Subhan Khan S/o Jamal Khan, Aged About 43 Years, Village Lakhmano Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Turkee Ki Basti, Panchayat Samiti Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
6. Maluk Khan S/o Misari Khan, Aged About 30 Years, Village Lakhmano Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Turkee Ki Basti, Panchayat Samiti Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.
7. Saleem Khan S/o Mochare Khan, Aged About 33 Years, Village Lakhmano Ki Basti, Gram Panchayat Turkee Ki Basti, Panchayat Samiti Sam, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary And Commissioner, Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Sub-Divisional Commissioner, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
3. The District Collector, Jaisalmer,
4. The Tehsildar, District Jaisalmer, Rajasthan

-----Respondents

(223) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11775/2025

Taju Khan S/o Isha Khan, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Girali



Kitwali, Tehsil Sindhari, District Balotra (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Balotra (Raj.).
3. Panchayat Samiti Sindhari, District Balotra Through Its Vikas Adhiakri

-----Respondents

(224) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11781/2025

Jagmal S/o Ramji Ram, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Village Bola Nagar (Bolo Ki Dhani), Gram Panchayat Gauda, Tehsil- Dhorimnna, District- Barmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Serva, District Barmer.
4. Tehsildar, Serva, District Barmer.


-----Respondents

(225) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11785/2025

1. Prema Ram S/o Utama Ram, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Neva Ki Dhani, Neva, Kanasar, Tehsil Bap, District Phalodi (Raj.).
2. Ashok Kumar S/o Shri Dhana Ram, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Kanasar, Tehsil Bap, District Phalodi (Raj.).
3. Manphul S/o Bhanwaru Ram, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Isarga Ki Dhani, Kanasar, Tehsil Bap, District Phalodi (Raj.).
4. Rajaram S/o Joraram, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Neva Ki Dhani, Kanasar, Tehsil Bap, District Phalodi (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus



1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Phalodi (Raj.).
3. Panchayat Samiti Bap, District Phalodi Through Its Vikas Adhikari.
4. Gram Panchayat Nawa, Tehsil Bap, District Phalodi Through Its Sarpanch.

----Respondents

(226) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11787/2025

Gangaram S/o Motiram, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Village Shankarpura, Gram Panchayat Sudaberi, District Barmer.

----Petitioner


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Division Dhorimanna, District Barmer.
4. Village Development Officer, Tehsil Dhorimanna, District Barmer.
5. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Barmer.
6. Tehsildar, Dhorimanna, District Barmer.

----Respondents

(227) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11793/2025

1. Sanskaran S/o Ramchander Ji, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village 14 Sgr, Lalpura Odan, Post Sardarpura Bika, Tehsil Suratgarh Dist. Sri Ganganagar.
2. Lal Chand S/o Shri Dana Ram Ji, Aged About 69 Years, R/o Village 14 Sgr, Lalpura Odan, Post Sardarpura Bika, Tehsil Suratgarh Dist. Sri Ganganagar.
3. Kewal Singh S/o Gurdayal Singh, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village 13 Sgr, Lalpura Odan, Post Sardarpura Bika, Tehsil Suratgarh Dist. Sri Ganganagar.
4. Laxman Singh S/o Pritam Singh, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Village 13 Sgr, Lalpura Odan, Post Sardarpura Bika,



Tehsil Suratgarh Dist. Sri Ganganagar.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Revenue Department (Group-1), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
2. The Secretary, Panchayati Raj And Rural Development, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.)
3. The District Collector, Sri Ganganagar.
4. The Sub Division Officer, Suratgarh, Dist. Sri Ganganagar.

-----Respondents

(228) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11799/2025

1. Nakhat Singh S/o Idan Singh, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Jalam Nagar Kheda Bagoriya Tehsil Dechu District Phalodi.
2. Mool Singh S/o Hari Singh, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Jalam Nagar Kheda Bagoriya Tehsil Dechu District Phalodi.

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Principal Secretary Cum Commissioner, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Phalodi
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Dechu, District Phalodi.
5. Tehsildar Dechu, District Phalodi.

-----Respondents

(229) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11820/2025

1. Rajesh Kumar S/o Shri Bhagwana Ram, Aged About 43 Years, Resident Of Village Asera, Gram Panchayat, Sherera, Panchayat Samiti Bikaner, District Bikaner.
2. Bhanwarlal S/o Shri Ramu Ram, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Asera, Gram Panchayat, Sherera, Panchayat Samiti Bikaner, District Bikaner.



3. Dula Ram Godara S/o Shri Phusa Ram Godara, Aged About 62 Years, Resident Of Village Asera, Gram Panchayat, Sherera, Panchayat Samiti Bikaner, District Bikaner.
4. Padma W/o Shri Bhanwarlal, Aged About 60 Years, Resident Of Village Asera, Gram Panchayat, Sherera, Panchayat Samiti Bikaner, District Bikaner.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Secretary To The Govt. And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Bikaner.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Bikaner, District Bikaner.
5. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Bikaner, District Bikaner.


-----Respondents

(230) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11833/2025

1. Ravindra Kumar Kanjar S/o Nihalchand Kanjar, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Village Subhash Nagar, Post Peeplond, Tehsil Jahazpur, District Bhilwara (Rajasthan).
2. Beerbal Kanjar S/o Nyalik Kanjar, Aged About 58 Years, R/o Village Subhash Nagar, Post Peeplond, Tehsil Jahazpur, District Bhilwara (Rajasthan).
3. Radheshyam Kanjar S/o Pannalal, Aged About 64 Years, R/o Village Subhash Nagar, Post Peeplond, Tehsil Jahazpur, District Bhilwara (Rajasthan).
4. Omraj Kanjar S/o Chanda Kanjar, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Village Subhash Nagar, Post Peeplond, Tehsil Jahazpur, District Bhilwara (Rajasthan).
5. Jitendra Kanjar S/o Garasiyalal Kanjar, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Village Subhash Nagar, Post Peeplond, Tehsil Jahazpur, District Bhilwara (Rajasthan).

-----Petitioners

Versus



1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector, Bhilwara.
3. Sub Divisional Officer Jahazpur, District Bhilwara.
4. Tehsildar, Jahazpur, District Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(231) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11840/2025

1. Surendra Singh S/o Shri Narayan, Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Jheekari, Khajoori, Tehsil Jahazpur, District- Bhilwara, Rajasthan - 311203.
2. Shiv Lal Gurjar S/o Shri Karana Gurjar, Aged About 64 Years, Resident Of Jheekari, Khajoori, Tehsil Jahazpur, District- Bhilwara, Rajasthan - 311203.

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector (Panchayat), District - Bhilwara, Rajasthan.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Jahazpur, District- Bhilwara, Rajasthan.
4. The Tehsildar, Jahazpur, District- Bhilwara, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(232) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11843/2025

1. Ganpat Lal S/o Sh. Bhoma Ram, Aged About 64 Years, R/o Village Maraja Nagar, Gram Panchayat Jhak, Tehsil Bilara, District Jodhpur.
2. Mana Ram S/o Sh. Shiv Ram, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Village Maraja Nagar, Gram Panchayat Jhak, Tehsil Bilara, District Jodhpur.
3. Hanuman Ram Khoja S/o Sh. Duda Ram Khoja, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Maraja Nagar, Gram Panchayat Jhak, Tehsil Bilara, District Jodhpur.
4. Badri Lal S/o Ghevar Lal, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Village Maraja Nagar, Gram Panchayat Jhak, Tehsil Bilara, District Jodhpur.



5. Manohar Lal S/o Sh. Guman Ram, Aged About 25 Years, R/o Village Maraja Nagar, Gram Panchayat Jhak, Tehsil Bilara, District Jodhpur.
6. Misa Ram S/o Sh. Ramji Ram, Aged About 71 Years, R/o Village Maraja Nagar, Gram Panchayat Jhak, Tehsil Bilara, District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary To The Government, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector, Jodhpur.
3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Bilara, District Jodhpur.
4. Tehsildar, Bilara, District Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(233) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11862/2025

1. Pokara Ram S/o Mana Ram, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Village Prabhusara, Tehsil Batadu, District Barmer.
2. Mangla Ram S/o Padma Ram, Aged About 71 Years, Resident Of Village Prabhusara, Tehsil Batadu, District Barmer.
3. Poonma Ram S/o Sona Ram, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Village Prabhusara, Tehsil Batadu, District Barmer.
4. Bhaga Ram S/o Virma Ram, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Village Prabhusara, Tehsil Batadu, District Barmer.
5. Om Prakash S/o Ganesha Ram, Aged About 25 Years, Resident Of Village Prabhusara, Tehsil Batadu, District Barmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer, Collector Premise, Barmer.
3. Tehsildar, Batadu, District Barmer.



-----Respondents

(234) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11870/2025

Banwari Lal Sharma S/o Ladulal Ji Sharma, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Kodiya, Tehsil Kotri, District Bhilwara.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary And Commissioner (Panchayati Raj Department), Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector Bhilwara, Having Its Office At Tehsil Kotri, District Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(235) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11872/2025

Rajesh Kumar Gadari S/o Badri Lal Gadari, Aged About 35 Years, Resident Of Fatehgarh, Tehsil Kotri, District Bhilwara.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary And Commissioner (Panchayati Raj Department), Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector Bhilwara, Having Its Office At Tehsil Kotri, District Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(236) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11873/2025

1. Ruga Ram S/o Harji Ram, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Village Dhiraram Sevar Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Sindhri, District Balotra.
2. Ram Singh S/o Deva Ram, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village Dhiraram Sevar Ki Dhani, Panchayat Samiti Sindhri, District Balotra.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.



2. Secretary, Revenue Department, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Balotra.
4. Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Division Sindhri District Barmer.
5. Village Development Officer, Tehsil Sindhri, District Balotra.
6. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, balotra.
7. Tehsildar, Sindhri, District Balotra.
8. Patwari Sindhri, District Balotra.

-----Respondents

(237) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11875/2025

Nathuram S/o Prahlad Ram, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of Bhadupura Goliyar, Goliyar, District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioner


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary And Commissioner (Panchayati Raj Department), Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector Barmer, Having Its Office At Barmer-Mahabar-Malpura-Gudamalani Road, Vishnu Colony, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(238) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11897/2025

1. Bhagwan Singh S/o Shri Sujaan Singh, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Labraau, Tehsil Ramsar, District Barmer.
2. Hathe Singh Rathore S/o Shri Tejmal Singh Rathore, Aged About 37 Years, R/o V And P Labraau, Tehsil Ramsar, District Barmer.
3. Badala S/o Talav, Aged About 52 Years, R/o V And P Labraau, Tehsil Ramsar, District Barmer.
4. Idal Khan S/o Shri Saffi Mohammad, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Village Chouthiya, Sinhani, District Barmer.
5. Subhan S/o Shri Hasam Basra, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Phahod Singh Nagar Tehsil Ramsar, Dist. Barmer.
6. Malam Singh S/o Shri Kamal Singh, Aged About 31 Years, R/o Banwarlie, Barmer.



-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. Secretary To The Govt. And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj., Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Barmer.
4. Sub-Divisional Officer, Ramsar, Dist. Barmer.
5. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Ramsar, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(239) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11906/2025

1. Ramesh Ram Motda S/o Shri Mishri Lal, Aged About 34 Years, Resident Of Village Lalki, Tehsil Rohat District Pali.
2. Dharamveer Singh Godara S/o Shri Kana Ram, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Village Lalki, Tehsil Rohat District Pali.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary Cum Commissioner, Panchayati Raj Department, Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Pali.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Rohat District Pali.
5. Tehsildar, Rohat District Pali.

-----Respondents

(240) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11908/2025

Keli Devi W/o Shri Thakraram, Aged About 75 Years, Resident Of Village Kalupura, Gram Panchayat Rajivnagar, Panchayat Samiti Sarnau, District Jalore.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of



The Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

2. District Collector, Jalore.
3. Sub-Divisional Officer Jalore, District Sri Ganganagar.
4. Tehsildar Sarnau, District Jalore.
5. Vikash Adhikari, Panchayat Samiti Sarnau, District Jalore.

-----Respondents

(241) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11910/2025

Abdul Rehman S/o Salim Khan, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Halo Potron Ki Basti, Tehsil Ramsar, District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

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

-----Respondents


(242) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11913/2025

1. Abdul Jabbar S/o Shri Kheru Khan, Aged About 30 Years, R/o Chand Khan Ki Dhani, Village Riyan, District Jodhpur.
2. Ramjankha S/o Shri Alij Khan, Aged About 65 Years, R/o 286, Chand Khan Ki Dhani, Village Riyan, District Jodhpur.
3. Valikha S/o Shri Umar Khan, Aged About 56 Years, R/o 768, Chand Khan Ki Dhani, Village Riyan, District Jodhpur.
4. Iliyas S/o Shri Samsu Khan, Aged About 27 Years, R/o Chand Khan Ki Dhani, Village Riyan, District Jodhpur.
5. Aamdeen S/o Shri Akbar Khan, Aged About 26 Years, R/o Chand Khan Ki Dhani, Village Riyan, District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.



2. Deputy Commissioner And Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(243) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11921/2025

1. Puka Ram S/o Shri Dhana Ram, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Lavera Kalan, Tehsil Baori, Jodhpur.
2. Panna Ram S/o Shri Jhipa Ram, Aged About 49 Years, R/o Tardo Ki Dhaniya, Lavera Kalan, Tehsil Baori, Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Deputy Commissioner And Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Jodhpur.

-----Respondents

(244) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11922/2025

1. Parasmal Gurjar S/o Heera Lal Gurjar, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village Surgati, Tehsil Kareda, Distt. Bhilwara (Raj.).
2. Suwa Lal S/o Naru, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Village Surgati, Tehsil Kareda, Distt. Bhilwara (Raj.).
3. Laharu Lal Gurjar S/o Heera Lal Gurjar, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Village Surgati, Tehsil Kareda, Distt. Bhilwara (Raj.).
4. Shankar Lal Gurjar S/o Kana Ram Gurjar, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Village Surgati, Tehsil Kareda, Distt. Bhilwara (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.



2. Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Bhilwara.
4. District Collector, Bhilwara.
5. Sub Divisional Officer, Tehsil Kareda, District Bhilwara.
6. Tehsildar, Tehsil Kareda, District Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(245) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11954/2025

1. Choga Ram S/o Shri Narasi Ram, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Madhopura, Dungri, District Jalore (Raj.).
2. Narpat Singh S/o Shri Prabhu Singh, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Madhopura, Dungri, District Jalore (Raj.).
3. Deva Ram S/o Shri Kehana Ram, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Madhopura, District Jalore (Raj.).
4. Sanvala Ram S/o Shri Mota Ram, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Madhopura, Dungri, District Jalore (Raj.).
5. Dala Ram S/o Shri Surata Ram, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Madhopura, Dungri, District Jalore (Raj.).
6. Ramchandra S/o Shri Nagji Ram, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Madhopura, Dungri, District Jalore (Raj.).
7. Mukana Ram S/o Shri Bhura Ram, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Madhopura, Dungri, District Jalore (Raj.).
8. Dwaraka S/o Shri Bhera Ram, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Madhopura, Dungri, District Jalore (Raj.).
9. Jiva Ram S/o Shri Dola Ram, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Madhopura, Tanpi, Duthwa, San chore, District Jalore (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through 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, Jalore (Raj.).
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jalore (Raj.).
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Chitalwana, District Jalore (Raj.).
7. The Tehsildar, Chitalwana, District Jalore (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(246) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11987/2025

1. Kailash Bishnoi S/o Bhagirath, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Titarwalo Ki Beri, Khume Ki Beri, District Barmer.
2. Suresh Kumar S/o Hanumana Ram, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Titarwalo Ki Beri, Khume Ki Beri, P.o. Doodhu, District Barmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of Panchyat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Dhorimnna District Barmer.
4. Tehsildar Dhorimnna, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(247) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11997/2025

1. Randhir S/o Shri Ramji Lal, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Village Sawai Chhani, Tehsil Bhadra District Hanumangarh.
2. Javeer Singh S/o Amar Chand, Aged About 49 Years, R/o Village Sawai Chhani, Tehsil Bhadra District Hanumangarh.
3. Ishwar Singh S/o Nand Ram, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Bhairu Chhani, Tehsil Bhadra District Hanumangarh.
4. Beer Singh S/o Jolram, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Village Bhairu Chhani, Tehsil Bhadra District Hanumangarh.
5. Bheems Singh S/o Shri Hemraj, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Village Sawai Chhani, Tehsil Bhadra District Hanumangarh.
6. Mahaveer S/o Shishpal, Aged About 50 Years, R/o

Village Bhairu Chhani, Tehsil Bhadra District
Hanumangarh.



-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Hanumangarh.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Hanumangarh.

-----Respondents

(248) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 11999/2025

Rajesh Sharma Alias Rajesh Pareek S/o Shri Sita Ram, Aged About 39 Years, Resident Of Behind Roadways Depot, Ward No. 25 Sardarshahar, District- Churu.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Director And Special Secretary, Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Churu (Raj.).
3. The Municipal Council, Sardarshahar, Through The Chairman, Municipal Council, Sardarshahar, District- Churu.

-----Respondents

(249) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12011/2025

Kailash Kumar S/o Rajendra Kumar, Aged About 32 Years, Resident Of - Ward No. 4, Sancheti Mohalla, Deshnok, District- Bikaner.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Director And Special Secretary, Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Bikaner (Raj.).
3. The Municipal Council, Deshnok, Through Executive Officer, Municipal Council, Deshnok, District- Bikaner.



-----Respondents

(250) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12015/2025

Pokara Ram S/o Dharma Ram, Aged About 53 Years, R/o Village Jhalipa, District Barmer, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub-Division Officer Barmer, District Barmer.
4. Tehsildar, Barmer, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(251) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12016/2025

1. Om Prakash Godara S/o Shri Hadmana Ram, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Ward No. 5, 33 Mukhya Gram, Dusaraana Bara, Pipasariya, Tehsil Sri Dungargarh, District Bikaner (Raj.).
2. Dala Ram S/o Badha Ram, Aged About 72 Years, R/o Ward No. 5, Dusrana Pipasariya, Dusrana Bara, Bikaner, Tehsil Sri Dungargarh, District Bikaner (Raj.).
3. Rameshwar Lal S/o Shri Bhera Ram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Ward No. 5, Dusrana Bara, Pipasariya, Tehsil Sri Dungargarh, District Bikaner (Raj.).
4. Bhanwarlal Busiya S/o Shri Beeruram Busiya, Aged About 52 Years, R/o Ward No. 5, Dusrana Bara, Pipasariya, Tehsil Sri Dungargarh, District Bikaner (Raj.).


-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Bikaner (Raj.).
3. Vikas Adhikari, Panchayat Samiti Sri Dungargarh, District Bikaner.

-----Respondents

(252) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12168/2025



1. Sohan Lal S/o Shri Kaju Ram, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Thoriyo And Aicharo Ki Dhani Village Shyam Nagar, Tehsil Kuchaman, District Deedwana And Kuchaman.
2. Malu Ram S/o Shri Pannaram Ji, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Thoriyo And Aicharo Ki Dhani Village Shyam Nagar, Tehsil Kuchaman, District Deedwana And Kuchaman.
3. Sohan Lal S/o Shri Joraram, Aged About 37 Years, R/o Thoriyo And Aicharo Ki Dhani Village Shyam Nagar, Tehsil Kuchaman, District Deedwana And Kuchaman.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, District Deedwana-Kuchaman, Rajasthan.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Kuchaman City, District Deedwana-Kuchaman, Rajasthan.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Nawa, Distt. Deedwana-Kuchaman.
5. Gram Panchayat Ghatwa, Through Panchayat Samiti Kuchaman, District Deedwana-Kuchaman Through Its Village Development Officer.

-----Respondents

(253) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12221/2025

Smt. Lalita Devi W/o Mukesh Kumar Ahari, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Post Bhojato Ka Oda, Tehsil And District Dungarpur.


-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Dungarpur.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Dovra, District Dungarpur.
4. Tehsildar, Dovra, District Dungarpur

-----Respondents

(254) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12248/2025



1. Ankit Kumar Toshniwal S/o Shri Mahaveer Prasad, Aged About 38 Years, Resident Of Pati Peda Ke Pas, Ward No. 25, Vtc Nokha, District Bikaner.
2. Saddam Husen S/o Shri Mumtaj Ali, Aged About 33 Years, Resident Of Masjid Chowk, Ward No. 15, Vtc Nokha, District Bikaner.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Local Self Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, (District Election Officer), Bikaner.
3. The Sub-Division Officer, (Election Officer, Nokha) Nokha, District Bikaner.
4. The Chief Executive Officer, Municipal Board, Nokha, District Bikaner (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(255) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12252/2025

Jai Singh Chundawat S/o Shri Kundan Singh Chundawat, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Malas, Dahimatha, District Bhilwara (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Bhilwara.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Kareda Bhilwara, District Bhilwara.
4. The Tehsildar, Kareda, District Bhilwara (Raj.).

-----Respondents


(256) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12263/2025

Sultan Ram S/o Bhuraram, Aged About 56 Years, R/o Ward No. 03, Jokhasar, Jabrasar, District Hanumangarh, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary,



Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.

2. District Collector, Hanumangarh.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Nohar, District Hanumangarh.
4. Tehsildar, Nohar, District Hanumangarh.

-----Respondents

(257) D. B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12272/2025

1. Chimna Ram S/o Gena Ram, Aged About 71 Years, R/o Village Jhadol @ Jerol, Tehsil Sanchoe, District Jalore, Rajasthan.
2. Khangara Ram S/o Aja Ram, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Village Jhadol @ Jerol, Tehsil Sanchoe, District Jalore, Rajasthan.
3. Kesara Ram S/o Karna Ram, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Village Jhadol @ Jerol, Tehsil Sanchoe, District Jalore, Rajasthan.
4. Prabhu Ram S/o Deva Ram, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Village Jhadol @ Jerol, Tehsil Sanchoe, District Jalore, Rajasthan.
5. Vaila Ram S/o Dana Ram, Aged About 43 Years, R/o Village Jhadol @ Jerol, Tehsil Sanchoe, District Jalore, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Department Of Panchayat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. District Collector, Jalore, Rajasthan.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Sanchoe, District Jalore, Rajasthan.
4. The Tehsildar, Sanchoe, District Jalore, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(258) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12282/2025

1. Manohar Singh S/o Ramnath, Aged About 64 Years, R/o Village Neshal Badi, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Churu. (Raj.).
2. Hanuman Singh S/o Jalu Ram, Aged About 77 Years, R/o Village Nanda Ka Bas, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Churu.



(Raj.).

3. Rajendra S/o Ramdhan, Aged About 56 Years, R/o Village Neshal Badi, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Churu. (Raj.).
4. Sadul Singh S/o Gang Singh, Aged About 58 Years, R/o Village Neshal Badi, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Churu. (Raj.).
5. Roshan Lal S/o Revant Singh, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Village Neshal Badi, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Churu. (Raj.).
6. Devkaran S/o Begu Ram, Aged About 67 Years, R/o Nanda Ka Bas, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Churu. (Raj.).
7. Dharam Pal S/o Girdhari, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Village Neshal Badi, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Churu. (Raj.).
8. Shree Chand S/o Ramnath, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Village Neshal Badi, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Churu. (Raj.).
9. Satyapal Singh S/o Hanuman, Aged About 38 Years, R/o Village Nanda Ka Bas, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Churu. (Raj.).
10. Jai Singh S/o Narna Ram, Aged About 44 Years, R/o Village Neshal Badi, Tehsil Rajgarh, District Churu. (Raj.).

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Churu.
3. Sub Division Officer, Rajgarh, District Churu.

-----Respondents

(259) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12304/2025

1. Kurichand Parmar S/o Shri Bada Parmar, Aged About 71 Years, R/o Jhareliya Fala, Panchayat H.q Padra, Panchayat Samiti Sagwara, District Dungarpur (Raj.).
2. Leela Ram Damor S/o Shri Nathu Damor, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Jhareliya Fala, Panchayat H.q Padra,



Panchayat Samiti Sagwara, District Dungarpur (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Dungarpur (Raj.).
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sagwada, District- Dungarpur (Raj.).
4. The Tehsildar, Tehsil- Sagwada, District- Dungarpur.

-----Respondents

(260) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12342/2025

1. Ganesh Lal Pargi S/o Shri Lavaji Pargi, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Chikli Puna, Chikli Teja, Tehsil Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).
2. Jamna Lal Pargi S/o Shri Mala Pargi, Aged About 70 Years, R/o Village Chikli Puna, Chikli Teja, Tehsil Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).

-----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, Banswara (Raj.).
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Banswara (Raj.).
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sub-Division, Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).
7. The Tehsildar, Tehsil Anandpuri, District Banswara (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(261) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12352/2025



Lal Singh Rajpurohit S/o Shri Gam Singh, Aged About 58 Years,
Resident Of Purohito Ka Was, Mauk, District Jalore.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary,
Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department,
Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Jalore.
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Jalore, District Jalore.

----Respondents

(262) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12385/2025

Ramkumar S/o Hettram, Aged About 70 Years, R/o Bachusar,
District Hanumangarh, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary,
Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of
Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Hanumangarh.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Nohar, District Hanumangarh.
4. Tehsildar, Nohar, District Hanumangarh.

----Respondents

(263) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12405/2025

Praveen Kumar S/o Sh. Mohan Lal, Aged About 46 Years,
Resident Of Mal Godam Road, Barmer, Rajasthan.

----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Chief Secretary,
Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The Local Self Department, Govt. Of Rajasthan Through
The Principal Secretary, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Secretariat,
Jaipur.
3. Director-Cum-Special Secretary, Local Self Department,
Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector, Barmer.
5. The Municipal Council, Barmer, Through Its



Commissioner.

-----Respondents

(264) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12429/2025

1. Lakh Singh S/o Shri Veeram Singh, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Village Pindiyo Ka Tala, Gram Panchayat Langer, Tehsil Land District Barmer (Raj.).
2. Ram Singh S/o Tikam Singh, Aged About 67 Years, Resident Of Village Pindiyo Ka Tala, Gram Panchayat Langer, Tehsil Land District Barmer (Raj.).
3. Peer Singh S/o Jagmal Singh, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Village Pindiyo Ka Tala, Gram Panchayat Langer, Tehsil Land District Barmer (Raj.).
4. Govind Singh S/o Padam Singh, Aged About 80 Years, Resident Of Village Pindiyo Ka Tala, Gram Panchayat Langer, Tehsil Land District Barmer (Raj.).
5. Bhur Singh S/o Kamal Singh, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Village Pindiyo Ka Tala, Gram Panchayat Langer, Tehsil Land District Barmer (Raj.).
6. Deep Singh S/o Padam Singh, Aged About 63 Years, Resident Of Village Pindiyo Ka Tala, Gram Panchayat Langer, Tehsil Land District Barmer (Raj.).
7. Babu Singh S/o Mal Singh, Aged About 36 Years, Resident Of Village Pindiyo Ka Tala, Gram Panchayat Langer, Tehsil Land District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of The Panchayat Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Tehsildar, Barmer, District Barmer.

-----Respondents


(265) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12435/2025

Babu Khan S/o Majeed Khan, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Pawta, Tehsil Chitalwana, District Jalore (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary And



Commissioner (Panchayati Raj Department), Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.

2. District Collector Jalore, Having Its Office At Tehsil Chitalwana, District Jalore.

-----Respondents

(266) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12437/2025

Abdul Gani S/o Saddiq, Aged About 55 Years, Resident Of Sakurgarh, Bhawatra, Tehsil Chitalwana, District Jalore (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary And Commissioner (Panchayati Raj Department), Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector Jalore, Having Its Office At Tehsil Chitalwana, District Jalore.

-----Respondents

(267) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12449/2025

Rana Ram S/o Raja Ram, Aged About 71 Years, R/o Village Paldi Devdan, Po Sarnau, Tehsil Sanchore, District Jalore.

-----Petitioner


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jalore.
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jalore.

-----Respondents

(268) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12472/2025

1. Ram Kumar S/o Shri Badri Ram, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Ward No. 2 Thakranwali, 13 Lnp, Chak 3 Lnp, Sriganganagar, Rajasthan.
2. Shivraj Singh S/o Shri Hukam Singh, Aged About 49 Years, R/o Ward No. 02, 13 Lnp II, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.
3. Hanuman S/o Shri Bhikaram, Aged About 39 Years, R/o



Ward No. 02, Village- Thakranwali, Po- 18 ML, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.

4. Kalyan Singh S/o Shri Sultan Singh, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Ward No. 02, 13 Lnp, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.
5. Anchal Singh S/o Shri Sultan Singh, Aged About 45 Years, R/o Ward No. 02, Thakarawali, 19 ML, Udyog Vihar, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.
6. Jagroop Sharma S/o Shri Baburam, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Chak Thakrawali, 13 Lnp, Hirnawali, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.

-----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, Sriganganagar (Raj.).
5. The Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Sriganganagar (Raj.).
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sub-Division, Sri Ganganagar, District Sriganganagar (Raj.).
7. The Tehsildar, Tehsil Sri Ganganagar, District Sriganganagar (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(269) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12514/2025

1. Prabhu Ram S/o Shri Aadu Ram, Aged About 61 Years, R/o Village- 32 M.L, Tehsil Raisinghnagar, District- Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.
2. Vakil Singh S/o Shri Banta Singh, Aged About 49 Years, R/o Village- 32 M.L, Tehsil Raisinghnagar, District- Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.
3. Nem Pal S/o Shri Dana Ram, Aged About 23 Years, R/o



Village- 32 M.L, Tehsil Raisinghnagar, District- Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.

4. Mangla Ram S/o Shri Khet Pal, Aged About 72 Years, R/o Village- 32 M.L, Tehsil Raisinghnagar, District- Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.
5. Palvinder Singh S/o Shri Baldev Singh, Aged About 29 Years, R/o Village- 32 M.L, Tehsil Raisinghnagar, District- Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.
6. Ashavdeep Singh S/o Shri Gurmohan Singh, Aged About 22 Years, R/o Village- 32 M.L, Tehsil Raisinghnagar, District- Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.
7. Ranjha Singh S/o Shri Ranjit Singh, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village- 32 M.L, Tehsil Raisinghnagar, District- Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.
8. Mahender Pal S/o Shri Ani Ram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village- 32 M.L, Tehsil Raisinghnagar, District- Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. Deputy Commissioner And Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. District Collector, Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.
4. Sub Divisional Officer, Raisinghnagar, District- Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.
5. Tehsildar (Revenue), Raisinghnagar, District- Sri Ganganagar, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(270) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12522/2025

Badri Lal Nayak S/o Shri Kanhaiya Lal Nayak, Aged About 46 Years, Resident Of Village Chhagan Khedi, Gram Panchayat Sansera, District Rajsamand (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary,



Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.

2. The District Collector, Rajsamand.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Relmagra, District Rajsamand (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(271) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12525/2025

Shankar Lal Jat S/o Shri Madhav Lal Jat, Aged About 70 Years, Resident Of Jat Mohalla, Chhapri District Rajsamand (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Rajsamand.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Relmagra, District Rajsamand (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(272) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12530/2025

Udai Lal Aheer S/o Shri Ganesh Lal Madara, Aged About 53 Years, Resident Of Village Madara, Gram Panchayat Sakrawas.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Rajsamand.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Relmagra, District Rajsamand (Raj.).


-----Respondents

(273) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12533/2025

Raten Singh S/o Shri Lahar Singh Rajput, Aged About 40 Years, Resident Of Near Hanuman Temple, Village Chokadi, Tehsil Relmagra, District Rajsamand (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus



1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Rajsamand.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Relmagra, District Rajsamand (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(274) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12536/2025

Banshi Lal Salvi S/o Ganesh Salvi, Aged About 50 Years, Salvi Mohalla, Village Gamerpura, Panchayat Samiti Sansera, District Rajsamand (Raj.)

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Rajsamand
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Railmagra, District Rajsamand (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(275) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12554/2025

1. Heeralal Gurjar S/o Paras Gurjar, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Ganeshpura, Gorkhaya, Karera, District Bhilwara.
2. Ramjan Khan S/o Piru Khan, Aged About 53 Years, R/o Baravalo Ka Kheda, Gorkhiya, District Bhilwara.

-----Petitioners


Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Bhilwara.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Kareda, Bhilwara.
4. The Tehsildar, Kareda, Bhilwara.
5. Village Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Kareda, Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(276) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12580/2025

1. Chattan Singh Shau S/o Late Shri Govardhan Lal, Aged



About 49 Years, Resident Of Sunar Street, Near Math Kui Chhoti Sadari, Pratapgarh (Raj.).

2. Prem Chand Teli S/o Suresh Chand Teli, Aged About 41 Years, R/o Ward No. 12, Gneshpura Road, Chhoti Sadari District Pratapgarh.
3. Nagesh Regar S/o Chen Ram Regar, Aged About 34 Years, R/o Regar Mohallah, Chhoti Sadri, District Pratapgarh.
4. Deepak Vyas S/o Suresh Chand Vyas, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Har Mandir Ke Pass, Dholapali, Ward No. 7, Chhoti Sadari, District Pratapgarh.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Local Self Government, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Pratapgarh.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Choti Sadari.
4. The Executive Officer, Municipal Board, Choti Sadari (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(277) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12638/2025

Rajendra Garasiya S/o Shri Revla Garasiya, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Macha, Ward No. 10 Macha, Itala, P.o. Itala, District Banswara, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Banswara (Raj.).
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Banswara.

-----Respondents

(278) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12666/2025

Mangilal Dodiya S/o Shri Valji Dodiya, Aged About 65 Years, Resident Of Balasindur, Tehsil Sajjangarh, District Banswara Rajasthan.



-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Banswara (Raj.).
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Banswara.

-----Respondents

(279) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12681/2025

1. Balveer S/o Harlal, Aged About 47 Years, Resident Of Village Ward No. No. 10, Rajpuria, 12 Jsn, Tehsil Nohar, District Hanumangarh (Raj.).
2. Sajjan Kumar S/o Dharmpal Singh, Aged About 52 Years, Resident Of Village Ward No. 8, Rajpuria, 12 Jsn, Tehsil Nohar, District Hanumangarh (Raj.).
3. Surjit S/o Bhimraj, Aged About 48 Years, Resident Of Village Ward No. 4, 14 Jsn, Gudia, Tehsil Nohar, District Hanumangarh (Raj.).
4. Maniram S/o Kaluram, Aged About 75 Years, Resident Of Village Ward No. 6, 14 Jsn, Gudia, Tehsil Nohar, District Hanumangarh (Raj.).
5. Ram Kumar S/o Gopal Ram, Aged About 74 Years, Resident Of Village Ward No. 10, 12 Jsn, Rajpuria, Tehsil Nohar, District Hanumangarh (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary To The Government, Department Of Panchayati Raj And Rural Development, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. District Collector, Hanumangarh (Raj.).
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Nohar, District Hanumangarh (Raj.).
4. Tehsildar, Nohar, District Hanumangarh (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(280) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12722/2025

1. Prem Singh Solanki S/o Laxman Singh Solanki, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Village Duwava, Post Sonagar,



Tehsil Bassi, Dist. Chittorgarh.

2. Shyam Lal Mali S/o Kulu Lal Mali, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Duwava, Post Sonagar, Tehsil Bassi, Dist. Chittorgarh.
3. Madhulal Meena S/o Mohan Lal Meena, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village Chhapiya Kheri, Post Sonagar, Tehsil Bassi, Dist. Chittorgarh.
4. Sukh Lal Suhalka S/o Ram Chandra, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Dahee Khera, Post Sonagar, Tehsil Bassi, Dist. Chittorgarh.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Revenue Department (Group-1), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Secretary, Panchayati Raj And Rural Development, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
3. The District Collector, Chittorgarh.
4. The Sub Division Officer, Chittorgarh, Dist. Chittorgarh.

-----Respondents

(281) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12732/2025

1. Vikas Manch, Registered Political Party Through President Lalit Kishore Jhanwar S/o Shyam Lal Jhanwar, Bhura Chowk, Post Office And Tehsil Nokha, District Bikaner (Raj.).
2. Sukharam Bhadu S/o Sugnaram Bhadu, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Near Bhadu Samudayik Bhawan, Kankariya Chowk, Nokha, District Bikaner (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Local Self Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The District Collector, Bikaner, Rajasthan.
3. The Director Cum Speical Secretary, Local Self Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
4. The Executive Officer, Municipal Board Nokha, District

Bikaner, Rajasthan.



-----Respondents

(282) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12744/2025

Ishe Khan Sadarani S/o Monge Khan, Aged About 62 Years,
Resident Of Village And Post Sankra, Tehsil Pokran, District
Jaisalmer (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary And
Commissioner (Panchayati Raj Department), Rural
Development And Panchayati Raj Department,
Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector Jaisalmer, Having Its Office At Tehsil
And District Jaisalmer.

-----Respondents

(283) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12748/2025

Khengararam S/o Shri Nangaraam, Aged About 67 Years, R/o
Gram Panchayat Bijaliya, Panchayat Samiti Bagoda, District
Jalore, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary, Department Of
Rural Development And Panchayat Raj, Govt. Of
Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jalore (Raj.).
3. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Jalore.

-----Respondents


(284) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12803/2025

1. Banka Ram S/o Tikmana Ram, Aged About 48 Years,
R/o Murtala Gala, Mhabar, Barmer.
2. Mota Ram S/o Ada Ram, Aged About 47 Years, R/o
Janiyon Ki Dhani, Mhabar Peethal, Barmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary,
Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan,
Jaipur (Raj.).



2. The District Collector, Barmer (Raj.).
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Barmer (Raj.).
4. Tehsildar, Barmer, District Barmer (Raj.).

-----Respondents

(285) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12804/2025

Bhanwar Singh S/o Sawaroop Singh, Aged About 50 Years,
Village Falwadi, Tehsil And District Sirohi (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

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

-----Respondents

(286) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12805/2025

1. Fata Ram S/o Talsa Ram, Aged About 32 Years, R/o Village Kagdara Jhupa, Panchayat Samiti Bali, District Pali (Raj.).
2. Sarupa Ram S/o Timaji, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Village Kagdara Jhupa, Panchayat Samiti Bali, District Pali (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Pali, Rajasthan.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Bali, District Pali, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(287) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12807/2025

1. Bhera Ram S/o Moti Ram, Aged About 39 Years, R/o Village Upla Bharla, Gram Panchayat Bhandar, Tehsil Bali, District Pali (Raj.).
2. Rama Ram S/o Nathu Ram, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Village Upla Bharla, Gram Panchayat Bhandar, Tehsil Bali, District Pali (Raj.).



-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Pali, Rajasthan.
3. Sub Division Officer, Bali, District Pali, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

(288) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12849/2025

Giradhar Singh S/o Ran Singh, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Bakhatpura, Shahdad Ka Par, Sheo. Gram Panchayat Rawatsar, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer.

-----Petitioner


Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Principal Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Barmer.
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer.
4. Tehsildar (Land Record), Gadra Road, Tehsil Gadra Road, District Barmer.
5. The Sarpanch, Gram Panchayat Rawatsar, Panchayat Samiti Gadra Road, District Barmer.

-----Respondents

(289) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12896/2025

1. Ram Karan Khoja S/o Purkha Ram Khoja, Aged About 59 Years, R/o Village Ratkuriya, Panchayat Samiti Pipar City, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
2. Gokal Ram Mundel S/o Hathi Ram Mundel, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village Khangata, Pipar Road, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
3. Yashpal S/o Madanlal, Aged About 49 Years, R/o Village Khariya Khangar, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
4. Dhagala Ram S/o Girdhari Ram, Aged About 56 Years, R/o Village Chaukri Khurd, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
5. Shyamlal S/o Hukma Ram, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Choyaloka Ka Bas, Village Malar, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.



6. Jai Ram S/o Teja Ram, Aged About 53 Years, R/o Jhakado Ka Bas, Bhundana, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
7. Asu Singh S/o Budh Singh, Aged About 57 Years, R/o Rawna Rajputo Ka Bas, Kagal, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
8. Manohar Singh S/o Om Prakash, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Khileriyo Ka Bas, Village Siyara, Tehsil Pipar City, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
9. Mana Ram Raliya S/o Kesa Ram Raliya, Aged About 56 Years, R/o Raliyo Ki Dhani, Village Khawaspur, Jodhpur, Rajasthan.
10. Sharwan Ram S/o Sugna Ram, Aged About 42 Years, R/o Village Ghodawat, Tehsil Pipar City, District Jodhpur, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
2. District Collector, Jodhpur.
3. The Tehsildar, Pipar City, District Jodhpur.
4. Gram Panchayat Ratkudia, Through Its Sarpanch, Panchayat Samiti Pipar City, Jodhpur.
5. Gram Panchayat Khariya Khangar, Through Its Sarpanch, Panchayat Samiti Pipar City, Jodhpur.
6. Gram Panchayat Khagggta Kagal, Through Its Sarpanch, Panchayat Samiti Pipar City, Jodhpur.
7. Gram Panchayat Bhundana, Through Its Sarpanch, Panchayat Samiti Pipar City, Jodhpur.
8. Gram Panchayat Malar, Through Its Sarpanch, Panchayat Samiti Pipar City, Jodhpur.
9. Gram Panchayat Khawaspura, Through Its Sarpanch, Panchayat Samiti Pipar City, Jodhpur.
10. Gram Panchayat Ghodhawat, Through Its Sarpanch, Panchayat Samiti Pipar City, Jodhpur.
11. Gram Panchayat Chokdi Kurd, Through Its Sarpanch, Panchayat Samiti Pipar City, Jodhpur.
12. Gram Panchayat Siyara, Through Its Sarpanch, Panchayat Samiti Pipar City, Jodhpur.



-----Respondents

(290) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 12905/2025

1. Mohan Ram Jani S/o Rewat Ram Jani, Aged About 48 Years, R/o Janio Ki Dhani, Village Ramsar, Karnu, District Nagour (Raj).
2. Purkha Ram S/o Budha Ram, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Village Ramsar, Karnu, District Nagour (Raj).
3. Asha Ram S/o Akha Ram, Aged About 36 Years, R/o Village Ramsar, Karnu, District Nagour (Raj).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary And Commissioner, Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector (Panchayat), Nagour.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Khinwasar, District Nagour.

-----Respondents

(291) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13113/2025

1. Kalu Lal Gurjar S/o Chotu Lal, Aged About 28 Years, Bhanpi, Post Sadas, Tehsil Gangrar, District Chittorgarh (Raj).
2. Ratan Lal Regar S/o Bheru Lal, Aged About 38 Years, Bhanpi, Post Sadas, Tehsil Gangrar, District Chittorgarh (Raj).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary And Commissioner, Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development



Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat,
Jaipur.

4. The District Collector (Panchayat), Chittorgarh.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Gangrar, District Chittorgarh.
6. The Tehsildar Gangrar, District Chittorgarh.

-----Respondents

(292) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13116/2025

1. Shiv Nath S/o Shri Devi Nath Ji, Aged About 46 Years, R/o Village Phagniya, Post Tumbadiya, Tehsil Gangrar, District Chittorgarh (Raj.).
2. Keshar Bai W/o Bhawani Nath Ji, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Village Phagniya, Post Tumbadiya, Tehsil Gangrar, District Chittorgarh (Raj.). Up-Sarpanch
3. Kalu Nath S/o Ghisha Nath Ji, Aged About 40 Years, R/o Village Phagniya, Post Tumbadiya, Tehsil Gangrar, District Chittorgarh (Raj.).
4. Narayan Nath S/o Heera Nath Ji, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village Phagniya, Post Tumbadiya, Tehsil Gangrar, District Chittorgarh (Raj.).
5. Narayan Nath S/o Bhawani Nath Ji, Aged About 35 Years, R/o Village Phagniya, Post Tumbadiya, Tehsil Gangrar, District Chittorgarh (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary And Commissioner, Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector (Panchayat), Chittorgarh.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Gangrar, District Chittorgarh.
6. The Tehsildar, Gangrar, District Chittorgarh.

-----Respondents

(293) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13122/2025



1. Man Singh S/o Shri Chotu Singh Ji, Aged About 46 Years, R/o- Village Dhuwaliya, Post-Tunbadiya, Tehsil-Gangrar, District-Chittorgarh (Raj.).
2. Vijay Panwar S/o Ladu Lal Ji, Aged About 32 Years, R/o- Village Dhuwaliya, Post-Tunbadiya, Tehsil-Gangrar, District-Chittorgarh (Raj.).
3. Arjun Lal Salvi S/o Vardha Ji, Aged About 60 Years, R/o- Village Dhuwaliya, Post-Tunbadiya, Tehsil-Gangrar, District-Chittorgarh (Raj.).
4. Kailash Singh S/o Gordhan Singh Ji, Aged About 45 Years, R/o- Village Dhuwaliya, Post-Tunbadiya, Tehsil-Gangrar, District-Chittorgarh (Raj.).

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Additional Chief Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The Secretary And Commissioner, Panchayati Raj Department, Secretariat, Jaipur.
3. The Additional Chief Secretary, Rural Development Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
4. The District Collector, (Panchayat), Chittorgarh.
5. The Sub Divisional Officer, Gangrar, District- Chittorgarh.
6. The Tehsildar, Gangrar, District-Chittorgarh.

-----Respondents

(294) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13150/2025

1. Jetharam S/o Shri Baluram, Aged About 68 Years, R/o Village Vishnu Nagar, Panchayat Samiti Osiyan, District Jodhpur.
2. Bhajnaram S/o Shri Budharam, Aged About 55 Years, R/o Village Vishnu Nagar, Panchayat Samiti Osiyan, District Jodhpur.
3. Udaram S/o Shri Manaram, Aged About 75 Years, R/o Village Vishnu Nagar, Panchayat Samiti Osiyan, District Jodhpur.
4. Chautharam S/o Shri Phagluram, Aged About 65 Years, R/o Village Vishnu Nagar, Panchayat Samiti Osiyan,



District Jodhpur.

5. Bagduram S/o Shri Sawantaram, Aged About 66 Years, R/o Village Vishnu Nagar, Panchayat Samiti Osiyan, District Jodhpur.
6. Udaram S/o Shri Dhunkal Ram, Aged About 70 Years, R/o Village Vishnu Nagar, Panchayat Samiti Osiyan, District Jodhpur.
7. Ashok Kumar S/o Shri Pancharam, Aged About 50 Years, R/o Village Vishnu Nagar, Panchayat Samiti Osiyan, District Jodhpur.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The 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, Jodhpur (Raj.).
5. Sub Divisional Officer, Osiyan, District Jodhpur.
6. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Osiyan, District Jodhpur.


-----Respondents

(295) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13273/2025

1. Govind Ram S/o Shri Birbal Ram, Aged About 27 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 07, 4-As, Panchayat Samiti Sri Vijay Nagar, District Sri Ganganagar.
2. Karamjeet Singh S/o Shri Darbara Singh, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Ward No. 08, 37 Gb, Panchayat Samiti Sri Vijay Nagar, District Sri Ganganagar.
3. Karni Singh S/o Shri Baldeev Singh, Aged About 44 Years, Resident Of Near Gurudwara 37 Gb, Panchayat Samiti Sri Vijay Nagar, District Sri Ganganagar.

-----Petitioners

Versus



1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur
2. Secretary To The Govt. And Commissioner, Department Of Rural Development And Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Jaipur
3. District Collector, Sri Ganganagar
4. Sub Divisional Officer , Sri Vijay Nagar, District Sri Ganganagar
5. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti, Sri Vijay Nagar, District Sri Ganganagar.

-----Respondents

(296) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13298/2025

1. Shera Ram S/o Shankar Lal, Aged About 25 Years, Sarpanch/administrator, Gram Panchayat Dholpadiya Nada, Tehsil Nokhara, District Barmer
2. Pachhi Khan S/o Haji Aklun Khan, Aged About 85 Years, Up Sarpanch, Dholpadiya Nada, Tehsil Nokhara, District Barmer
3. Nizam Khan S/o Pachhi Khan, Aged About 63 Years, R/o Dholpadiya Nada, Tehsil Nokhara, District Barmer
4. Sadi Khan S/o Kadar Khan, Aged About 75 Years, R/o Dholpadiya Nada, Tehsil Nokhara, District Barmer
5. Saleem Khan S/o Noora Khan, Aged About 60 Years, R/o Dholpadiya Nada, Malpura, District Barmer

-----Petitioners

Versus

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


-----Respondents

(297) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13392/2025

Shankar Lal Luhar S/o Shri Chhagan Lal Luhar, Aged About 58 Years, Resident Of Near Hospital Mandal Hatheepura Bhilwara (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus



1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayati Raj, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. The District Collector, Bhilwara.
3. The Sub Divisional Officer, Kareda, District Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(298) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13710/2025

Gopal Lal Gurjar S/o Lalaram, Aged About 42 Years, Resident Of Village Motipura, Gangithala, Tehsil Jahajpura, District Bhilwara (Raj.).

-----Petitioner

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary And Commissioner (Panchayati Raj Department), Rural Development And Panchayati Raj Department, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur.
2. District Collector Bhilwara, Having Its Office At Tehsil Jahajpura, District Bhilwara.

-----Respondents

(299) D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 13949/2025

1. Khet Singh S/o Khewar Singh, Aged About 47 Years, R/o Village Serawa, Post Sonu, Tehsil Ramgarh, Jaisalmer.
2. Mag Singh S/o Ranjeet Singh, Aged About 62 Years, R/o Village Serawa, Post Sonu, Tehsil Ramgarh, Jaisalmer.

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. The State Of Rajasthan, Through Its Secretary, Revenue Department (Group-I), Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
2. The Secretary, Panchayati Raj And Rural Development, Government Of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur (Raj.).
3. The District Collector, Jaisalmer.
4. The Sub Division Officer, Jaisalmer, Dist. Jaisalmer.

-----Respondents

(300) D.B. Civil Writ petition No.12363/2025

Bhagwat Singh S/o Shri Devi Singhji, Aged About 54 Years, R/o Village Jasol, Tehsil Pachpadra, District Balotra, Rajasthan.

-----Petitioner



Versus

1. State of Rajasthan Through Its Secretary, Rural Development and Panchayati Raj Department, Government of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur, Rajasthan.
2. The Deputy Commissioner and Deputy Secretary (First), Rural Development and Panchayati Raj Department, Government of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur Rajasthan.
3. The Principal Secretary, Local Self Government Department, Government of Rajasthan, Secretariat, Jaipur Rajasthan.
4. The Director Cum Special Secretary, Government of Rajasthan, Local Self Government Department, Secretariat, Jaipur Rajasthan.
5. District Collector Balotra, Balotra, Rajasthan.
6. Chief Executive Officer, Zila Parishad, Barmer, Rajasthan.
7. Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Balotra, Balotra, Rajasthan.
8. Govindram Kharwal S/o Shri Ranaram Kharwal, R/o Chamund Chowk, Kharwalon Kas Bass, Pachpadra, Rajasthan.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) appearing in Jaipur Bench	:	Mr. R.N. Mathur, Sr. Adv. assisted by Mr. Digvijay Rajawat & Mr. Nikhil Saini Mr. Suresh Pareek, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Nathu Singh Chauhan Mr. S.K. Gupta, Sr. Adv. assisted by Ms. Surabhi Agarwal & Mr. Lokendra Sharma Mr. Virender Godara Mr. Tanmay Dhand Mr. Rahul Kamwar with Mr. Bharat Kumar Todi, Mr. Vaibhav Nirwal and Mr. Trinath Sharma Mr. Pardeep Malik Mr. Gajendra Singh Rathore and Mr. Navdeep Singh Mr. Sandeep Kalwaniya Mr. Govind Lal Choudhary Mr. Pradeep Kalwania and Ms. Sushila Kalwania Mr. Indresh Sharma with Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sharma Ms. Shalini Yadav, Mr. S.N. Kumawat and Ms. Shivani Paliwal Mr. Sunil Samdaria along with Mr. Arihant Samdaria and Mr. Ramesh Chand Bairwa
---	---	---

Mr. Hari Kishan Saini
Mr. Ram Pratap Saini with
Mr. Aamir Khan
Mr. Ajathshatru Mina with
Ms. Parneet Kaur,
Mr. Movil Jeenwal,
Mr. Rajat Chaudhary,
Ms. Niti Jindal and
Mr. Nrip Raj Singh
Mr. Deepak Sharma
Mr. Tara Chand Sharma
Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma
Sh. Sanwar Mal Chaudhary, present in
person with Mr. Vikash Ghosalya
Mr. Bajrang Sepat on behalf of
Ms. Komal Kumari Giri
Mr. Mahendra Kumar Saini
Mr. Umesh Kumar Sharma
Mr. Vijay Pathak and
Mr. Vinod Kumar Singhal
Mr. Amit Singh Shekhawat
Mr. Sanjay Sharma with
Mr. Ravindra Singh
Mr. R.B. Sharma Ganthola
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Goyal
Mr. Laxmi Kant Malpura
Mr. Hanuman Choudhary
Mr. Gajanand Yadav
Mr. Ashwinee Kumar Jaiman
Mr. Sandeep Pathak with
Mr. Palash Gupta
Ms. Naina Saraf with
Mr. Pritam Singh
Mr. Sunil Kumar Singodiya
Mr. Vibhuti Bhushan Sharma
Mr. M.S. Raghav with
Mr. Vishwas Saini
Mr. Ashok Bansal with
Mr. Pawan Sharma
Mr. Punit Singhvi along with
Mr. Ayush Singh,
Mr. Ajay S. Rathore,
Ms. Shraddha Mehta,
Ms. Mihir Jangid,
Mr. Yashovardhan Agarwal and
Mr. Naman Dadhich
Mr. Ashish Kishore Saksena
Mr. Bharat Yadav
Mr. R.D. Meena
Mr. Shailesh Prakash Sharma
Mr. Kawal Singh Loha
Mr. Arvind Kumar Bansheewal
Mr. Sudhir Gupta
Ms. Bhavana Laddha

Mr. Fahad Hasan
 Mr. Ved Prakash Sogarwal
 Mr. Kunal Jaiman with
 Mr. Meyhul Mittal
 Mr. Naveen Dhuwan
 Mr. Mahipat Lal Meena with
 Mr. Rajendra Singh
 Mr. Balveer Singh Beniwal
 Mr. Vaibhav Bhargava
 Mr. Manoj Kumar Avasthi
 Mr. Naresh Kumar Singhal
 Mr. Rajeev Kumar Sogarwal
 Mr. Dilip Sharma
 Mr. Bhavya Kala on behalf of
 Mr. Rajesh Kala
 Mr. Prem Chand Dewanda,
 Ms. Manisha Dewanda,
 Mr. Abhishek Singh,
 Mr. Ajay Poonia,
 Mr. Anikate Jangid,
 Mr. Rahul Singh and
 Mr. Vikram Singh
 Mr. Ravi Kumar Palsaniya with
 Mr. Anilendra Pandey (through V.C.)
 Mr. Amit Kumar Gautam
 Mr. Pradeep Mathur

For Petitioner(s)
 appearing in Jodhpur
 through VC

: Mr. Rajendra Prasad, Advocate
 General assisted by Mr. Anirudh Singh
 Shekhawat, AAAG, Ms. Harshita
 Thakral, Ms. Dhriti Laddha and
 Mr. Tanay Goyal in D.B. S.A.W.
 Nos.831/2025 and 1005/2025.
 Mr. Indra Raj Choudhary, AAG with
 Mr. Kuldeep Singh Solanki, AAAG &
 Mr. Pawan Bharti, AAAG in D.B.
 S.A.W. Nos.831/2025 and 1005/2025
 Mr. S.S. Ladreacha, AAG with
 Mr. Yogesh Sharma in D.B. S.A.W.
 Nos.831/2025 and 1005/2025
 Mr. Rajesh Panwar (Sr. Adv.), AAG
 assisted by Mr. Ayush Gehlot
 Mr. Ravindra Puri Goswami, AGC
 Ms. Monal Chugh
 Ms. Meenal Singhvi in D.B. S.A.W.
 Nos.831/2025 and 1005/2025
 Mr. Nathu Singh Rathore, AAG with
 Mr. Arpit Samara, AAAG &
 Ms. Khushi Sharma in D.B. S.A.W.
 Nos.831/2025 and 1005/2025
 Mr. Rajesh Joshi, Sr. Adv. assisted by
 Mr. Harshit Burani and
 Ms. Kamini Joshi
 Mr. G.R. Punia, Sr. Adv. With

Mr. Ram Dayal
Mr. Madan Beniwal,
Mr. Sanjay
Mr. Jaideep Singh Saluja and
Ms. Harger Kaur
Mr. Manoj Bhandari, Sr. Adv. with
Mr. Shreyansh Bhandari
Mr. Aniket Tater
Mr. Dinesh Kumar Joshi
Mr. Pranjal Babel on behalf of
Mr. Sanjay Nahar
Mr. Pushkar Taimni
Mr. Pranav Bhardwaj
Mr. Avik Aggarwal
Mr. Nishant Gaba
Mr. Muktesh Maheshwari
Mr. Chatur Bhuj
Mr. Pradhuman Singh
Mr. Pritam Joshi
Mr. Vivek Choudhary
Mr. Shailendra Gwala
Mr. Manish Patel
Mr. Vikas Choudhary
Mr. Sumer Singh Gour
Mr. Mukesh Kumar
Mr. Varda Ram Choudhary
Mr. D.L.R. Vyas
Mr. J.S. Naruka
Mr. Vikas Bijarnia
Mr. Punit Choudhary
Mr. Aashish Jakhar
Mr. Sumit Fageria
Ms. Akshiti Singhvi for
Mr. Rajat Arora
Mr. Lucky Rajpurohit
Mr. Piyush Sharma
Mr. Deen Dayal Chitlangi
Mr. Binja Ram Jajra
Mr. Om Prakash
Mr. Ramavtar Singh Choudhary,
Mr. Siddharth Mewara and
Mr. Prashant Kachchhawa for
Mr. Moti Singh
Mr. Hemendra Singh Sever
Mr. Lakshya Singh Udawat
Mr. Ram Dev Potalia
Mr. Sunil Chaudhary
Mr. A.R. Godara
Mr. Dhan Raj Vaishnav
Ms. Rajani Choudhary
Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh
Mr. Pradyuman Rajpurohit
Mr. K.L. Chauhan
Ms. Nidhi Singhvi on behalf of

Mr. Deelip Kawadia
Mr. Aidan Choudhary
Mr. Prashant Kachiwal
Mr. Pankaj Mehta
Ms. Tuli Taniya Raman Ekta
Mr. Mehta Jubin Pankaj Sarika
Dr. Laxman Singh Bhati
Mr. Shahbaz Khan
Mr. Suresh Nehra
Dr. Ashok Choudhary
Mr. D.D. Godara
Mr. Manas Ranchhor Khatri
Mr. Shyam Sunder Paliwal
Mr. Deepak Sarswat
Mr. Harshit Khatri
Mr. Sahee Ram Mundel
Mr. Ikbali Khan
Mr. Kamal Kishore Bissa
Mr. Gajendra Singh Chouhan
Mr. Hargovind Chanda
Mr. Jitender Singh Bhaleria
Mr. Sukhdev
Mr. Vishwas Khatri for
Dr. Mohit Singhvi
Mr. Peerane Khan
Mr. Abdul Kadir
Mr. R.J. Punia
Mr. Manoj Kumar Pareek
Mr. Aashish Kumar
Mr. Saransh Vij
Mr. Avdhesh Parashar with
Mr. Kanishk Singhvi
Mr. Pratap Singh
Mr. Shiv Singh
Mr. Dheerendra Singh Sodha
Mr. Divik Mathur
Mr. Jitendra Singh Rathore in D.B.
C.W. No.11205/2025.
Mr. Pankaj Sharma
Mr. Shiv Lal Barwar
Mr. Ratan Ankiya
Mr. Bhim Raj Mudia
Ms. Anuradha (through V.C.)
Mr. Arjun Singh
Mr. Yashveer Singh with
Mr. Manvendra Singh Rathore
Mr. Ashok Kumar Godara
Ms. Alka Pandey
Mr. Karan Singh Rajpurohit
Mr. Mayank Rajpurohit
Mr. Manish Tak
Mr. Khatri Vishwash Girish with
Mr. Krishan Singh Rathore
Mr. Swaroop Singh Sisodia

Mr. Kishore Kumar
Mr. Rameshwar Prashad Sharma
Mr. Anada Ram Beniwal
Mr. Shanker Singh Rajpurohit
Mr. C.R. Choudhary
Mr. Rekha Ram Choudhary
Mr. Abhimanyu Khatri
Mr. Raghunath Bishnoi
Mr. Manjeet Godara
Mr. Sohan Lal Jain
Mr. Abhinav Jain
Mr. VLS Rajpurohit
Mr. Ranjeet Joshi
Mr. Kapil Bissa
Mr. Sajjan Singh Rajpurohit
Mr. Manish Bhunwal
Mr. Ashok Godara
Mr. Bharat Rajpurohit
Mr. Gorkh Singh for
Mr. Vinod Kumar Sihag
Mr. A.R. Godara
Mr. Khitij Vyas
Mr. Mukesh Kumar Trivedi
Mr. S.R. Godara
Mr. Sunil Dhaka
Mr. Devi Lal Rawla
Mr. P.K. Rawla
Mr. Himanshu Shrimali in D.B. C.W.
No.10205/2025.
Mr. Roshan Lal in D.B. C.W.
No.10789/2025.
Mr. Himanshu Pareek and
Mr. Naman Mohnot in
D.B. C.W. No.9292/2025.
Ms. Laxmi Rathore in D.B. C.W.
No.9811/2025, 9893/2025,
11069/2025, 11107/2025 and
11191/2025,11195/2025.

For Respondent(s)
appearing in Jaipur
Bench

: Mr. Rajendra Prasad, Advocate
General assisted by Ms. Harshita
Thakral, Mr. Tanay Goyal, Ms. Dhriti
Laddha and Mr. Sheetanshu Sharma
Ms. Shikha Sharma on behalf of
Mr. G.S. Gill, AAG
Mr. Kapil Prakash Mathur, AAG
assisted by Mr. Saurabh Sharma and
Ms. Divya Rathore
Mr. Surendra Kumar Saini
Mr. S.S. Hora with
Mr. Himanshu Agarwal
Mr. Falak Mathur and
Mr. Salim Khan Gori
Ms. Poonam Rao on behalf of
Mr. Neeraj Batra

Mr. Rishi Raj Maheshwari
Mr. Azad Ahmed
Mr. S.K. Panwar

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Rajendra Prasad, Advocate
appearing in Jodhpur General assisted by
through VC Mr. Anirudh Singh Shekhawat, AAAG,
Ms. Harshita Thakral,
Ms. Dhriti Laddha and
Mr. Tanay Goyal
Mr. Indra Raj Choudhary, AAG with
Mr. Kuldeep Singh Solanki, AAAG and
Mr. Pawan Bharti, AAAG.
Mr. S.S. Ladrecha, AAG with
Mr. Yogesh Sharma
Mr. Rajesh Panwar (Sr. Adv.), AAG
assisted by Mr. Ayush Gehlot
Mr. Ravindra Puri Goswami, AGC
Ms. Monal Chugh
Ms. Meenal Singhvi
Mr. Nathu Singh Rathore, AAG with
Mr. Arpit Samara, AAAG &
Ms. Khushi Sharma
Mr. Sharwan Godara for
Ms. Neelam Sharma, AGC
Mr. Manish Patel in D.B. C.W.
No.7749/2024 and D.B. S.A.W.
No.1005/2025
Mr. K.L. Vishnoi (Caveator)
Mr. Dinesh Kumar Joshi in D.B. S.A.W.
No.831/225.
Ms. Laxmi Rathore in D.B. S.A.W.
No.831/2025 and D.B. C.W.
No.9274/2025.
Mr. Jitendra Singh Rathore in D.B.
C.W. No.10329/2025
Mr. Ramniwas Haniya in D.B. C.W.
No.11246/2025, D.B. C.W.
No.11303/2025 and D.B. C.W.
No.11310/2025
Mr. Jitender Singh Bhaleria in D.B.
C.W. No.11997/2025
Mr. VLS Rajpurohit in D.B. C.W.
No.12429/2025.
Mr. Keshav Bhati, for respondent
No.5, in D.B. C.W. No.11512/2025


HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE MR. SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEET PUROHIT

Judgment

CONCLUSION OF ARGUMENTS : 12.08.2025

RESERVED ON

PRONOUNCED ON



: 12.08.2025 / 13.08.2025,
14.08.2025 / 25.08.2025 &
26.08.2025,

: 14th/11/2025

REPORTABLE

Per, The Bench :

PARTS	CONTENTS	PARA NOS.	PAGE NOS.
PART-I	PREFACE		
	(a) Constitutional & Statutory Scheme relating to Local Self Institutions	1-6	296-298
	(b) Brief background of present bunch of litigation	7-9	298-300
	(c) Issues involved	10-11	300-303
PART-II	SUBMISSIONS		
	(a) Submissions of Petitioners/ Appellants	12-49	303-327
	(b) Submissions of respondents	50-64	327-341
PART-III	RELEVANT PROVISIONS AND ANALYSIS		
	(a) Constitutional provisions	65-67	341-348
	(b) Provisions of Raj. Panchayati Raj Act, 1994	68-85	348-359
	(c) Provisions of Raj. Municipalities Act, 2009	86	359-363
PART-IV	ANALYSIS AND REASONING		
	(a) Categorization of petitions	87-90	363-365
	PART A - PETITIONS CHALLENGING FINAL NOTIFICATION OF DELIMITATION ISSUED U/S 101 OF THE ACT OF 1994 / SEC. 3 OF THE ACT OF 2009	91-148	366-414
	PART B - WRIT PETITIONS CHALLENGING PROCESS OF DELIMITATION INITIATED IN PURSUANCE OF ONE MONTH'S NOTICE ISSUED UNDER SECTION 101 OF THE ACT OF 1994	149-167	414-425
	PART C - WRIT PETITIONS CHALLENGING PROCESS OF DELIMITATION / ALTERATION OF WARD BOUNDARIES IN ABSENCE OF ANY CHANGE IN CENSUS DATA OR VARIATION IN THE NUMBER OF WARDS	168-177	425-430
	PART D - WRIT PETITIONS CHALLENGING REMOVAL OF PANCHAYAT SAMITI MEMBERS / PRADHAN ON THE GROUND THAT THEIR RESPECTIVE ELECTORAL WARD IS INCLUDED WITHIN THE TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION OF A MUNICIPALITY	178-188	430-437
	PART E - WRIT PETITIONS CHALLENGING ORDERS PASSED BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT APPOINTING THE OUTGOING SARPANCH AS	189-200	437-444

	ADMINISTRATOR OR WRIT PETITIONS SEEKING APPOINTMENT OF ONGOING CHAIRPERSON OF MUNICIPALITY AS ADMINISTRATOR		
	PART F - WRIT PETITIONS CHALLENGING / SEEKING DIRECTION FOR FIXING OF VILLAGE HEADQUARTER	201-207	444-449
	PART G - WRIT PETITIONS SEEKING DIRECTIONS TO DECLARE / HOLD THE ELECTIONS.	208-223	449-465
	FINAL DIRECTIONS	224	465-467

PART I - PREFACE

(a) CONSTITUTIONAL & STATUTORY SCHEME RELATING TO LOCAL SELF INSTITUTIONS

1. The governance mechanism in India was largely with the Union of India and the States and Union Territories, under the Constitution. However, urban local self governance and organisation of Village Panchayats was an aspiration as envisaged under Article 40 of the Constitution wherein it was provided that *the State shall take steps to organise village panchayats and endow them with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as units of self-government.*
2. The concept of self governance was initially regulated and controlled by the executive of the States. The Parliament while bringing out amendment in the Constitution inserting Part-IXA, under its objects and reasons, recognized that the system as was being followed, was pleased with many vices and could not acquire the status and dignity of responsible people bodies.
3. Accordingly, Part-IX introduce a three tier system of Panchayat Raj Institutions at Village, intermediate and district levels, while Part-IXA introduce a system of three types of municipalities based on the size of urban areas, the lowest being an area of transition from rural area to an urban area. Articles



243B and 243Q mandated institutions of local governance in the States based on ratio between population and territorial areas and number of cities. It also provided for reservation for different sections of society which deserve representation as per population. With the amendment, the governance stands distributed in between Union, States and Local Self Governance with a separate sphere of functioning as per the schedules to the Constitution.

4. While the three governance have to act in tandem with each other, the Indian federalism puts more stress on overall governance to the Union, followed by the State Government and then the local governance amongst the local bodies which, of course, has to be under the supervision of the States. The functions of the third limb of governance, namely local self governance, have been clearly outlined under Articles 243G, 243H, 243W and 243X, and Eleventh and Twelfth Schedules of the Constitution.

5. Local self governance, thus, treats a District to be a third territorial unit after the Central and the States, and local self governance for various levels under the District comprising of rural and urban areas forms the source of self governance, as envisaged in the Constitution. The essence of democracy, thus, lies in the manner the local authorities function and, therefore, periodical elections at grassroot level become a necessary ingredient. The scope and functional structure of Panchayati Raj and municipal institutions form the basis for conducting such elections. Delimitation of territory, therefore, has an important role in identifying participation of the people at large in a



particular territory in representation at Panchayats and municipalities. The State legislature has been empowered to enact laws for all the purposes as envisaged under Part-IXA of the Constitution.

6. Accordingly, the State of Rajasthan legislature enacted Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 and Rajasthan Municipalities Act, 2009, to which we may refer at appropriate stage of this judgment. The Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1953 and the Rajasthan Panchayat Samiti & Zila Parishad Act, 1959 were repealed and the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 was brought into force w.e.f. 23.4.1994 vide gazette notification. From time to time there have been certain amendments made. Similarly, Rajasthan Municipalities Act, 1959, wherein amendments had been made from time to time by the legislature in consonance with the provisions incorporated in Part IXA of the Constitution, was repealed and the Rajasthan Municipalities Act, 2009, was enacted by the State legislature vide notification dated 11.9.2009 w.e.f. 15.9.2009, which comprehensively deal with all the aspects relating to local self governance at the level of municipalities.

(b) BRIEF BACKGROUND OF PRESENT BUNCH OF LITIGATION

7. The present bunch of matters are relating to delimitation exercise undertaken or concluded by the State Government relating to the Panchayati Raj Institutions or Municipality, across the State; the ancillary issues arising thereto, the consequential action taken in pursuance thereof as well as postponement of the elections of Local Self Institutions. The writ petitions have been filed before learned Single Bench as well as PIL petition before the



Division Bench of this Court at Principal Seat at Jodhpur as well as Bench at Jaipur. In relation to interim orders / interlocutory order passed by learned Single Judge, has given rise to some D.B. Special Appeal (Writ) also.

8. The then Chief Justice vide his order dated 14.07.2025 passed in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.7718/2025 and other connected matters, has directed to list the said bunch of writ petitions along with D.B. Civil Writ Petition (PIL) No.1285/2025 as well as some other cases listed before the learned Single Judge at Principal Seat as well as at Jaipur Bench. There were certain appeals preferred against the order passed by the learned Single Judge in certain petitions pending at Principal Seat at Jodhpur, namely D.B. Special Appeal Writ No.831/2025 (State of Rajasthan and Ors. Vs. Dhanna Ram and Ors.), which too was directed to be listed together for analogous hearing. The relevant portion of order dated 14.07.2025 is reproduced below :-

"When these matters come up for consideration on various issues raised pertaining to delimitation of Panchayat areas and municipal areas based on various grounds, it is brought to the notice of this Court that earlier a petition seeking direction for holding election was taken up for consideration by this Court and it was brought to the notice of the Court that number of petitions have already been filed at Principal Seat, Jodhpur and Bench Jaipur, which also challenge notification regarding constitution of Panchayat and Municipal areas and interim order has also been passed in some of the cases. That bunch of petitions, which were directed to be listed for analogous hearing, in our view, should also be taken up for consideration along with these cases, which have been listed today, to avoid conflict of orders.

Learned Advocate General submits that State has filed an appeal against interim order which is pending consideration before the Principal Seat of this Court at Jodhpur.

Present batch of petitions as well as D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.1285/2025 and other cases are directed to be listed for analogous hearing along with these cases and D.B. Special Appeal Writ No.831/2025 (Pending before Principal Seat Jodhpur) is also required to be heard analogously in order to maintain parity.

This is so because in number of petitions, which are being listed today, prayer for interim order is being made on the basis of interim order passed by the learned Single Judge in certain petitions pending at Principal Seat of this Court at Jodhpur against which writ appeal has been filed and listed for consideration.

Registry is directed to connect all these petitions and list them along with D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.1285/2025 and all other cases earlier directed which are listed for analogous hearing along with D.B. Special Appeal Writ No.831/2025 on 21.07.2025.


Learned State Counsel shall ensure that in all Panchayat matters challenging delimitation notifications and matters connected therewith, this order is brought to the notice of learned Single Benches as and when the matters come up for consideration both at Principal Seat of this Court at Jodhpur and Bench Jaipur.

A copy of this order be placed on record of each petition."

9. Accordingly, all these cases were taken up and with the benefit of technology of using video conferencing, we were able to hear the arguments advanced by several counsels arguing cases from Principal Seat at Jodhpur as well as counsels from Jaipur. The technology was used in a manner that all the lawyers were privy to the arguments being advanced either at Jodhpur or at Jaipur and were, therefore, able to submit arguments in rejoinder. Hearing took place for several days and the judgment was reserved.

(c) ISSUES INVOLVED

10. From the analytic and comparative analysis of the pleadings of the respective parties in the present bunch of the writ



petitions / special appeals, broadly following issues need to be addressed by us comprehensively and relatively :

Issue No.I

Whether the final delimitation notifications issued under Section 101 of the Act of 1994 or Section 3 of the Act of 2009 can be challenged under the writ jurisdiction of this Court ?

Issue No.II

Whether the notification dated 05.05.2025 issued by the Rural Development and Panchayati Raj Department issued on the basis of notifications issued from time to time regarding delimitation for the various Panchayats and Municipal Councils laying down the new boundaries can be said to be legal and justified?

Issue No.III

Whether the notification issued by the State Government dated 16.01.2025 postponing elections of Gram Panchayats, where the tenure was completed and where the tenure was expiring on 21.01.2025 and appointing the outgoing Sarpanch as administrators and constituting Administrative Committees invoking Section 95 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 was just and proper?

Issue No.IV

Whether the consequential orders treating the post of concerned Panchayat Member/Pradhan/Municipal



Corporator as vacant on account of delimitation exercise is legal and justified?

Issue No.V

Whether the individually duly elected person can be removed from the post and another person be appointed on his place after the said person had lost the election for holding the post?

Issue No.V

Whether decision of the State Government to conduct elections of all the Panchayats together after conducting delimitation exercise can be said to be legal and justified?

Issue No.VI

Whether the delimitation exercise could be conducted without fresh Census? Whether delimitation exercise can be conducted in an existing local body without their being any inclusion or exclusion of territories?

Issue No.VII

Whether the mandamus can be issued for holding elections of dissolved local bodies?

Issue No. IX

Whether an Administrative Officer can be appointed as Administrator in the intervening period i.e. after completion of tenure of the Municipal Body and before completion of fresh election ?

Issue No. X

Whether the writ petitions challenging the process of delimitation initiated under Section 101 of the Act of

1994, where final delimitation notification has not yet been passed, are maintainable ?

11. The broad issues identified above, from the pleadings of the parties across this bunch of writ petitions / special appeals, along with other connected and ancillary issues, will be addressed and decided in the category-wise adjudication undertaken by this Court in the succeeding paragraphs of this judgment.

PART II – SUBMISSIONS

(a) SUBMISSIONS OF PETITIONERS / APPELLANTS :

12. S/Shri Hanuman Choudhary, Shailesh Prakash Sharma, Punit Singhvi, Pradeep Kalwania, M.S. Raghav, Prem Chand Dewanda, Sunil Kumar Singodiya and R.N. Mathur, Senior Advocate mainly advanced arguments at Jaipur Bench while Sunil Joshi, Manoj Bhandari, Ramavtar Singh Choudhary, Dinesh Kumar Joshi, Ranjeet Joshi, Varda Ram Choudhary, Moti Singh, Narayan Singh Solanki, Ganesh Ram Jat, Rajesh Joshi, Senior Advocate, J.R. Ponia, Sr. Adv. have advanced arguments from Principal Seat at Jodhpur through video conferencing and Shri Rajendra Prasad, Advocate General has argued on behalf of the State. Various counsels for the petitioners / appellants as well as counsel for the respondent – State have also submitted their respective written submissions. The arguments / contentions of the respective parties are succinctly summed up below :-

13. Shri Hanuman Choudhary, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 9856/2025: Banshidhar Khandela Vs. The State of Rajasthan has submitted that the power of delimitation, inclusion/exclusion of local body, Gram Panchayat in the true spirit of the statutory provisions with a predetermined approach, the




authorities have misused and misinterpreted the provisions to suit their purposes resulting in ousting of duly elected Pradhans. He submits that the objections which were received from the villagers were required to be addressed too by the District Collector and opportunity of hearing should have been provided to them before taking a final decision for issuing notification under Section 101 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994. He submits that the order passed by the learned Single Judge at Principal Seat at Jodhpur in S.B. Civil Writ Peittion No.8576/2025, Dhanna Ram and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors. was required to be followed and decision should have been taken in the said terms.

14. Mr. R.N. Mathur, learned Senior Advocate appearing in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.7043/2025: Sonu Kumari Vs. State of Rajasthan and Anr., submitted that the notification issued under Section 3 of the Rajasthan Municipalities Act, 2009 is against the spirit of Article 243 of the Constitution of India and there has been a complete non-application of Mind. He submits that the notification results into violation of Provisions of the Rajashtan Panchayati Raj Act as well as the Rajasthan Municipal Act. Article 243 of the Constitution, in his submission, provides for democratic governance at village as well as urban levels. Eleventh Schedule of the Constitution provides for functions of Panchayat and Twelfth Schedule of the Constitution provides for functions of Municipalities. On comparison of the same, it is apparent that the factors for consideration of village development are wider and broader in nature. By limitation excluding a Gram Panchayat results in depriving the Gram Panchayat from rural development curtailing the rights of the people living in that Panchayat. He



submits that firstly, in terms of Article 243Q, the rural area ought to have been first declared as transitional area and prior consultation with the Election Commissioner has not been done, more so, as it is the Election Commissioner alone who is authorized to conduct elections. He submits that the exercise has been undertaken for political considerations without due application of mind. The upliftment of rural area was required to be kept in mind before taking such decisions by the State. He relies on **Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK) Vs. Secretary, Governor's Secretariat** reported in **(2020) 6 SCC 548** and **The State Of Goa Vs. Fouziya Imtiaz Shaikh** reported in **(2021) 8 SCC 401** in support of his submissions. He has also invited our attention to order passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Meghraj Kothari V. Delimitation Commission** reported in **AIR 1967 SC 669** to submit that prior consultation with State Election Commissioner is necessary and an enquiry is required to be made at the level before conducting the delimitation exercise.


15. **Shri J.R. Poonia, learned Sr. Adv. appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.8748/2025: Deva Ram Vs. State of Rajasthan** and Ors., has apart from supporting the submissions of Mr. R.N. Mathur, Senior Advocate has advanced his submissions pointing out that judicial review can be done by this Court even after the notification has been issued and relies on the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK) Vs. Secretary, Governor's Secretariat** (*supra*) and **The State Of Goa Vs. Fouziya Imtiaz Shaikh** (*supra*).



16. Shri Prem Chand Dewanda, learned counsel appearing in D.B. Civil Writ (PIL) Petition No.1285/2025: Giriraj Singh Devanda and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors., has submitted written submissions with respect to the PIL and supports his submissions on the basis of judgment passed by the Supreme Court in the case of **Suresh Mahajan Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh and Anr. reported in 2022 (12) SCC 770; Kishansing Tomar Vs. Municipal Corporation of the City of Ahmedabad and Ors. reported in 2006(8) SCC 352; Municipal Board, Begun and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors. reported in 1991 AIR Rajasthan 14; Sau. Durgeshwari Rajesh Kale Vs. State of Maharashtra and Ors. reported in 2021 (3) AIR BomR 476; Guddi and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors. (D.B. CWP No.2002/2020) and P.K. Kunju Vs. State of Kerala and Ors. reported in 1970 AIR Kerala 252** apart from the law as already cited hereinabove.

17. He submits that violation of Article 243E of the Constitution which mandates continuing for five years only and no longer it also mandates as per Proviso to complete the election before the expiry of tenure. He submits that postponing election by way of impugned notifications is ultra vires to the Constitution. Article 243K(1) vest Superintendent direction and control for preparation of electoral rolls and they are duty bound to complete the election before expiry of the tenure, but the State Election Commission has failed to discharge its constitutional mandate.

18. He submits that the authentication by the only Governor is lacking in the impugned notification, rendering the notification to be constitutional defective. He also submits that there is misuse of




Section 17 and Section 95 of the Panchayati Raj Act, 1994. Further, the outgoing Sarpanch or Ward Panch could not have been appointed as Administrator and the action is arbitrary and does not have any nexus to the objects sought to be achieved. They could not have been retained in the office and continuing of the existing body beyond five years was contrary to the mandate under Article 243E of the Constitution. Even the Administrator cannot be allowed to continue for a period exceeding six months upon dissolution of Panchayats. He submits that no reasons have been provided for postponement of Panchayat Election and the notification is clearly arbitrary exercise of power which violates Article 14 of the Constitution. There has been a usurpation of the democratic rights and violates basic structure principle.

19. Mr. Pradeep Kalwania, learned counsel appearing in D.B. Special Appeal Writ Nos.628/2025, in his written submissions challenged the inclusion of the Village Gulabbari in Gram Panchayat Parmanpura in Shahpura Block and the consequential order of the learned Single Judge rejecting his petition as premature as no final decision was taken by the Government, he argues in his D.B. Special Appeal Writ No.627/2025 that the guidelines issued by the State on 10.01.2025 and 13.02.2025 which mandated proposal of reorganization and re-demarcation to be prepared on the basis of the data of the Census of the year 2011. He submits that as per the guidelines, the minimum population should be kept at 3,000 and maximum at 5,500 and the headquarter of the newly created Gram Panchayat should be kept in the village as far as possible, to which adequate means of transportation are available so that there is easy contact with all



the other villagers of the Gram Panchayat. There should be a Government Offices in the village with other facilities such as School, Panchayat Bhawan, Anganwadi Center, Patwal Bhawan, Kisan Seva Kendra and other Government Offices for which sufficient land should be available, but the Sub Divisional Officer in an arbitrary and unreasonable manner, issued order on 11.02.2025 whereby, the District Collector approved inclusion of Revenue Village Gulabbari in the newly created/proposed Gram Panchayat Parmanpura by excluding from the existing Gram panchayat Maharkhurd. In support of his submission that Village Gulabbadi should have been declared as headquarter of Gram Panchayat instead of Parmanpura, he has invited attention to the population as per Census 2011 of Village Gulabbadi was 2196 to that of Parmanpura was 1796. Gulabbadi was situated at State Highway No.37 while Village Parmanpura is situated in remote area. There is an English Medium School at Village Gulabbadi. A-Grade Veterinary Husbandry Hospital is also situated and an old Post Office whereas postel work is conducted for Parmanpura via Gulabadi. Main water tank is constructed and distance from District Headquarter is 47 Kilometer while distance of Parmanpura is 55 Kilometers. Village Gulabbadi is 25 Kilometers from the Sub-Divisional Headquarter, however, Village Parmanpura is 30 Kilometer away. He submits that there was no occasion of inclusion of Revenue Village of Gulabbari in the new Gram Panchayat Parmanpura.

20. Similar arguments had been advanced for Village Gomawali which has been included in the newly formed Gram Panchayat



Trilokpura and removed from the existing Gram Panchayat Sihodi in Panchayat Samiti Srimadhapur in District Sikar.


21. Mr. Tanmay Dhand, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.6505/2025, has raised the submission as to whether the State can withdraw previous notification issued under Article 243Q of the Constitution by virtue of notification under Section 3(1) of the Rajasthan Municipalities Act, 2009 and revert a municipality included as transitional area to Village Panchayat. He has referred to the notification dated 24.3.2021 whereby the Revenue Village Todiya Ka Bas, Gram Panchayat Lekri, District Alwar was declared as transitional area under Article 243Q of the Constitution and included within the limits of Nagar Palika Bansur, and the new notification dated 27.3.2025 whereby the limits of Nagar Palika Bansur were altered resulting in withdrawal and revival of Village Panchayat Todiya Ka Bas, Gram Panchayat Lekri. He relies on a judgment passed in **Bhanwar Lal Mundra & Ors. v. State of Rajasthan & Ors. (DB Civil Writ Petition No.10491/2009) decided on 13.5.2015.**

22. Mr. Rajesh Kumar Sharma and Mr. Deepak Sharma, learned counsels appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition Nos. 6721/2025 and 9804/2023 have submitted that even if a person is disqualified on account of Ward being shifted from one Panchayat Samiti to Municipality, he would continue to remain as Pradhan as the election of Pradhan is not only the part of a village of particular area which may become part of municipal council on account of delimitation, but also represents the other Gram Panchayat of concerned Panchayat Samiti. Petitioner, therefore, cannot be removed from the post of Pradhan merely because the village



from where he had been elected as a Member stands dissolved and inviting attention to Sections 2(8), 17, 30, 38 of the Act of 1994, he submits that the concerned person who has been elected as Pradhan would, therefore, continue to perform work upto the period of five years.

23. Mr. Ravi Kumar Palsania and Mr. Anilendra Pandey, learned counsels who are appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition Nos. 6988/2025, 8868/2025, 9206/2025, 9187/2025, 9427/2025, 9364/2025, 9363/2025, 9428/2025, 9424/2025, 9385/2025, 9399/2025, 10542/2025, 10541/2025, 11046/2025, 11606/2025, 9427/2025, in their written submissions have submitted that the notification dated 10.01.2025 does not indicate any reasons for reorganization of all the panchayats. In number of cases, it is submitted that the parameter of 6 kilometer distance and guidelines which were laid down for delimitation have been violated. It is submitted that there is no administrative necessity for current delimitation exercise being conducted. It is further submitted that the objection filed before the Collector have remained undecided and resultantly, the litigation have been taken before this Court. He further submits that even there were provisions under the law for allowing the delimitation. The same cannot be said to be absolute and unrestricted. The State Government cannot act arbitrarily and without giving out any reasons. The democratic set up cannot be allowed to be disturbed. It is submitted that the parameters which have been laid down for delimitation in the year 2021 like, population, nature of work of the local geographical situation ought to be taken into consideration for the purpose of constitution of Municipalities. The




acts, as alleged, could not be undertaken without considering the public interest.

24. Mr. Indresh Sharma, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.6648/2025, in his written submission has submitted the similar arguments, as noticed above, with regard to Village Sajanpuri which has been directed to be excluded while forming Nagar Palika Laxmangarh and he submits that the village ought to have been included in the urban local body. Denial of inclusion has resulted, in his submissions, derivation of civic amenities. It is his submission that other two villages who are at equal distance have been included, the State ought to have been included the Village Sajanpuri also. He submits that the action of the respondents is not in accordance with law and there has been a complete non-application of mind in laying down the standards and while taking such arbitrary decision leaving out the village to form Municipal Council Laxmangarh. Learned counsel has relied on the judgment of **Champa Lal Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.** reported in **AIR 2018 SC 2352** in support of his submissions.

Mr. Indresh Sharma, learned counsel also appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.6191/2025, in his written submissions claims for inclusion of Village Mojpur.

25. Mr. Shailesh Prakash Sharma, learned counsel appearing in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.6124/2025, in his written submission has submitted that petitioners who were Ward Panchs of Gram Panchayat Hathikhera which consist of three villages (Revenue Villages Hathikhera, Boraj and Kajipura) elected in January 2021 for a fixed five-year term till 21.01.2006. However, in account of



the notification dated 25.03.2025, the said villages have been included in the earlier Municipal Corporation, resulting in ousting of the elected members. He submits that on account of inclusion of the villages, the petitioners' democratic mandate has been disrupted and the villages have been deprived of the rural schemes such namely MNREGA, PMAY, Bada Bandi, etc. It also increased taxation, restricts use of community land and would result in causing administrative inconvenience. It is his further submission that the post precedents have been ignored and submissions of the administrative authorities are required to follow uniform standards which have been continued to be followed previously on account of inclusion of the villages. It is submitted that local residents would face great amount of hardship and common lands for grazing and public purposes would be restricted.

26. In D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.4686/2025 filed by Ex-MLA Sanyam Lodha as a public interest litigation, the issues raised are essentially the same as raised in D.B. Civil Writ Petition (PIL) No. 1285/2025: Giriraj Singh Devanda Vs. State of Rajasthan. Shri Punit Singhvi, learned counsel, in his written submissions, has reiterated the submission with regard to the necessity to conduct election on or before expiry of the terms of the elected member of the Municipality in terms of Section 11(2)(i) read with Section 7 of the Rajasthan Municipalities Act, 2009. Learned counsel further submits that the appointment of Administrator of the Municipality is not within the jurisdiction of the State. He relies on **Suresh Mahajan Vs. State of MP (2022) 12 SCC 770** and **Kishansing Tomar Vs. Municipal Corpn.: 2006 8 SCC 352**.



27. Mr. Sunil Samdariya, learned counsel appearing in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.9974/2025: Ram Kanwar Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors., in his written submissions has submitted that the guidelines dated 10.01.2025 and 13.02.2025 issued by the respondents could not have been violated and Gram Panchayats could not have been altered or created in violation of population parameters as prescribed in the aforesaid guidelines. He submits that as per guidelines dated 10.01.2025, the Government prescribed the minimum population of 3000 and maximum population of 5500 for creation of new Gram Panchayat, but they have lowered the term. It is submitted that however, 15% deviation was allowed relating to population matrix vide notification dated 13.02.2025. Policy decision requires to be adhered to strictly and he submits that the State Government cannot speak in two voices. District Collector has failed to prescribe the guidelines which provided for determinable standards. He also relies on judgment passed by the Division Bench in the case of **Gram Vikas Manch Samity, Bhinay Vs. State of Rajasthan (D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.5795/2022)** wherein contention of the State Government that policy is not binding, was rejected. He also relies upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of "**Ms X Vs. Registrar General, High Court of Madhya Pradesh**" reported in **(2022) 14 SCC 187** and submitted that delimitation of Gram Panchayats, Tehsil-Viratnagar was wholly unjustified and the principles laid down in the administrative guidelines and policy were required to be adhered to.




28. Mr. Pradeep Kalwania, learned counsel appearing in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.8269/2025 in his written submission has relied on judgment passed in the case of "**Kuldeep Kumar Vs. U.T. Chandigarh (2024 INSC 129)**" and submits that on account of political pressure, notification dated 24.03.2025 was issued extending the area of the existing municipal council, Shahpura to include Revenue Village Devan, Madho Ka Bas and Lobdawas. He submits that the action has been taken to remove the petitioner who has been elected as a Pradhan under the symbol of Indian National Congress. Learned counsel submits that there has been no declaration, declaring a new area as Municipal council Shahpura and the notification dated 24.03.2025, therefore, deserves to be quashed. He submits that merely because one part of the area of the Municipal council has been declared as surplus and included in the Municipal Corporation, the Pradhan, Smt. Pista Devi who was elected and holding in-charge was required to be consulted and could not have been removed by declaring the post of Pradhan as vacant. He submits that merely because the post of Ward Member has to be treated as dissolved on account of the concerned Panchayat having been added in the Municipal areas, the Pradhan cannot be automatically removed on account of being Member of the Said Panchayat. He submits that the altered membership of a Ward Member can be removed in terms of Section 101(5A) of the Act of 1994. Since the Panchayat Samiti continues to remain in existence, therefore, the post of Pradhan should remain unaffected. He relies the submissions, as noticed hereinabove, on this aspects. It is further stated that the petitioner was elected as Pradhan for a period of 5 years in the



year 2021 and ought to be allowed to continue on the post till she completes her 5 years tenure. Opportunity of hearing prior to delimitation order is mandatory and keeping in with the rule of *audi alteram*. He also relies on judgment passed in the case of **Ashok Ganpat Jadhav and Anr. Vs. State Election Commission Mumbai and Ors.** reported in **2000(4) ALL MR 565** as well as **Kuldeep Kumar Vs. U.T. Chandigarh** (supra).


29. Mr. Naveen Dhuwan, learned counsel appearing in D.B. Civil Writ Petition Nos.8670/2025, 8714/2025, 8718/2025, 9403/2025 and 9405/2025, for Gram Panchayat Bhadwasi, in his written submission reiterates what we have already noticed in the written submissions of other cases. It is submitted that when the Nagar Parishad prepared a plan for the proposed area to include in the Municipal area, the entire area of Gram Panchayat Bhadwasi was not included and only one revenue Village Jagmalpur was included. It is his submission that the Municipality also raised concern for not including of the areas, but only the villages in the periphery ought to be included, however, vide notification dated 22.04.2025 and order dated 05.05.2025, the Panchayati Raj Department has been declared that the elected representatives of the included area in municipality would be considered to be removed. He submits that the elected members ought not to be treated as removed on account of delimitation exercise.

30. Mr. Vikash Ghosalya, learned counsel appearing in D.B. Civil Writ (PIL) Petition No.9199/2025: Sanwar Mal Chaudhary and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and ors., in his written submission has submitted that creation of Ringus as Panchayat Samiti by splitting existing Panchayat Samiti Khandela, District Sikar under the



process of delimitation vide notification dated 10.01.2025 is illegal, arbitrary and unjustified. He submits that as per notification dated 10.01.2025, only those Panchayat Samiti should be reconstituted if there are 40 and above Gram Panchayats of population of 2 lacks and above as per census of 2011. While there are 45 Gram Panchayat under territory of Panchayat Samiti Khandela in which two Gram Panchayats have been included in the boundaries of Municipality Khandela. Nine new Gram Panchayats have been proposed by the District Collector, Sikar and total population of the Panchayat and Gram Panchayats would be 2.57022 lacs and therefore, denial is fulfilling all the criteria for reconstitution. The Block Development Officer had made a proposal to create Ringus as new Panchayat Samiti by splitting the existing Panchayat Samiti Khandela and several Gram Panchayats have also made representations for creation of a new Panchayat Samiti Ringus from the Panchayat Samiti Khandela, but the State Government has totally ignored the creation of Ringus as a new Panchayat Samiti. It is submitted to be discriminatory and arbitrary. Learned counsel has relied on Section 13(2) of the Act of 1994 and therefore, the present public interest litigation petition has been filed demanding for creation of Panchayat Samiti Ringus.


31. Mr. Nikhil Saini, learned counsel appearing in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.7043/2025: Sonu Kumari Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors., in his written submission has stated that vide notifications dated 24.03.2025, 22.04.2025 and 28.04.2025, the Revenue Village Banwas, Moi Sadda and Village Dhani Hukma have been included in Nagar Palika Singhana and the Pradhan who was elected as a member from the said Panchayats has been deemed



to be removed and his charge has been handed over to respondent No.7- Smt. Sarla. The submission is similar to the as raised hereinabove alleging that there is a non-application of mind and arbitrariness in taking such decisions. It is stated that no study or survey was undertaken to exclude the Revenue Villages from Panchayat Samiti Singhana and including in Nagar Palika, Singhana. Nagar palika Singhana itself constituted by notification dated 19.04.2023 and within short span, the Revenue Villages of panchayat Samiti Singhana have been included resulting in affecting the residents of the Gram Panchayats from benefits of the rural schemes. He relies on Division Bench judgment passed in the case of **Bhagwat Singh Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.:** **(D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.12363/2025)** decided on **06.08.2025** and the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Kishorchandra Chaganlal Vs. Union of India (2024 INSC 579)**.

32. Mr. Pradeep Kalwania, learned counsel appearing in D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.9640/2025: Ganesh Ram Jat Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors., similar written submission have been filed raising same grounds and arguments which have already been noticed hereinabove with respect to assertion that a Pradhan would continue to hold the post up to 5 years inspite of his being removal as a Ward Member of the Panchayat.

33. Mr. Sunil Kumar Singodiya, learned counsel appearing in D.B. Civil Writ Petition Nos.5550/2025, 5583/2025, 6804/2025, 7762/2025, 7857/2025, in his written submissions has raised similar grounds and submissions as raised by Mr. Pradeep kalwania, learned Advocate hereinabove. He asserts that the



scheme of Rules and Act would not deprive an elected Pradhan or Sarpanch from continuing his office up to statutory period of five years merely on account of inclusion of the Gram Panchayat in Municipal Board and consequential removal from the post of Member. They cannot be declared to be removed from the post of Pradhan/Sarpanch.

34. Mr. Manjeet Godara, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition Nos.11997/2025: Randhir And Ors. Vs. The State of Rajasthan and Ors., in his written submission has submitted that the proposed inclusion of Revenue Villages Sawai Chhani and Bhairu Chhani in Gram Panchayat Gadi Chhani in spite of existing inclusion in Gram Panchayat Gadi Chhani is unjustified. He submits that Revenue Village Bhairu Chhani and Sawai Chhani are situated in the same place adjacent to each other with a common Government High Secondary School. He submits that the newly formed Gram Panchayat Bhairu with headquarter Ber is wholly unjustified as the number of villagers in two villages are more than that in Ber. Village Ber is 9 kilometer away, he, therefore, submits that the action is clearly arbitrary and with non-application of mind.

35. Mr. Dinesh Kumar Joshi, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.8576/2025: Dhanna Ram and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan filed at Principal Seat at Jodhpur, in his written submissions has submitted that Gram Panchayat Matora was having two revenue villages namely Matora and Shivnagar and the Sarpanch was from Village Matora. The Revenue Village Shivnagar was divided into Shivnagar and Mahadev Nagar. Revenue Village Matora was divided into Matora and Balaji Nagar. Vide notice dated



07.04.2025, the Revenue Village Mahadev Nagar and Shiv Nagar and Balaji Nagar was excluded from Gram Panchayat Matora and included in Hanumansagar and Lakheta and further, Revenue Village Sanwta was excluded from Hanumansagar and included in Matora, and the same was challenged by the villagers of the villages Mahadev Nagar, Shiv Nagar and Balaji Nagar before the Tehsildar, SDM and Collector Phalodi, but their voice was not heard, therefore, they challenged the same in the present petition preferred before the Court. Learned counsel submits that it was at the instance of the counsel appearing for the State that the High Court passed a direction to decide objections raised by the villagers. It is submitted that Gram Panhayat Matora having all public facilities which is only 1 to 4 kilometers away, whereas Gram Panchayat Hanumnsagar and Lakheta is far away ranging between 9 to 11 kilometer and no public facilities are available. The action of the respondents is without application of mind, whimsical, discriminatory, arbitrary and also contrary to the guidelines laid down by the State Government dated 10.02.2025. It was submitted that the action ought to be declared null and *void ab initio*.

36. Mr. Pradhuman Singh, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.2148/2025: Rajasthan Panchayat Samiti Sadsya Sangh and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Anr. filed at Jodhpur, in his written submissions, has challenged the notifications dated 16.01.2025 and 18.01.2025 and submits that the administrative powers of the Gram Panchayats, term of which was completed on 31.01.2025, could not have been allowed to continue through their existing Sarpanch and Village Development



Officer by appointing them as Administrators in terms of Section 95 of the Act, on dissolution of the Panchayati Raj Institution, the Members and the Chairperson, on the date of dissolution, may vacate their respective offices. Thus, the District Collector and the State Government cannot appoint the Sarpanch or the Village Development Officer as Administrator as they are no more holding any authority in the concerned Panchayati Raj Institution. They can, in no manner, be said to be officer or authority and they are ceased to continue on the said post. The charge of Administrator should be given to the Block Development Officer or an officer subordinate to the State Government in terms of Section 98 of the Act. Once there is completion of term, the election was required to be held at the earliest to extending and accommodating the existing Sarpanch and Village Development Officer. The matter relates to the order passed by the District Collector, Tonk with respect to Gram Panchayat Sonva, District Tonk.

37. Mr. Ramawtar Singh Choudhary, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.8698/2025: Sahdev Singh Bhati and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors. filed at Jodhpur, in his written submission, has challenged the letter dated 13.02.2025 proposing the re-delimitation of Wards of Municipal Board, Taranagar. He submits that the State Government had earlier issued a notification whereby, the wards had been determined on the basis of population and various other municipalities delimitation was conducted, however, there was no action for delimitation of Municipal Board,, Taranagar. It is submitted that the impugned order dated 13.02.2025 seeks delimitation of Municipality Board whose election would be conducted in October, 2025 and



November, 2025. He submits that on the basis of same population, there being no change and number of 35 wards also not having been changed. There is no occasion to change the boundaries of the Wards and the same would not have any object or nexus. He submits that as per Section 6 of the Act of 2009, the number of Wards would be determined only on the basis of population as ascertained with the latest census. Municipality would be divided into number of Wards as no number of seats fixed for Municipality in terms of Sub-Section (1) of Section 6 after conducting the exercise in terms of Section 3. The action of the respondents, in his submission, is violative of all the aforesaid provisions. He relies on the order passed in the case of **Jai Singh Meena Vs. State of Rajasthan (S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.997/2009)**. He also relies on the Division Bench judgement of Punjab and Haryana High Court relating to Municipal Council Dera Baba Nanak District Gurdaspur and an order passed by this Court in **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.3390/1990 (Azizulaha Khan Vs. State of Rajasthan) decided on 06.09.1990**. He also relies on **Rajesh Kumar Sharma and Ors. Vs. State of Punjab (CWP No.7548/2023) decided on 17.10.2023**.


38. Mr. Devilal R. Vyas, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.8858/2025: Imam and Anr. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors. and in S.B. Civil Writ Petition Nos.9094/2025, 9149/2025, 9274/2025, 9386/2025, 9412/2025, 9925/2025, 10065/2025, 11023/2025, 11053/2025, 11063/2025, 11083/2025, 11087/2025, 11112/2025, 11114/2025, 11117/2025, 11314/2025, 11493/2025, 11910/2025 and 13298/2025 filed at Jodhpur, in his written submissions has



submitted that there is no proper way for access to the villagers of village Rhuma Aziz Ki Basti and challenged the creation of new Gram Panchayat Harjiyaniyon Ki Dhani, wherein the said village has been included along with one other village Binjasar Dher. It is submitted that the villagers would have to first travel to Village Akaliya Dhora and thereafter, Binjram Road to the headquarters thereby covering a distance of about 11 KM. The Patwar Mandal, Binjasar has issued a certificate dated 17.04.2025 with regard to the distance, whereas he submits that another issue of Gram Panchayat Meethe Ka Tala showing an approximate distance 12 kilometer, the Sub Division Officer has reflected the distance to only 5.5 kilometers between the newly formed Gram Panchayat and Village Rahuma Aziz Ki Basti wherein petitioners are residents. Learned counsel submits that in spite of guidelines laid down in the circular, the respondents have failed to take notice of all the aspects. The objections have been raised, but they are not being considered.

39. Mr. Vivek Sharma, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.11516/2025: Pursottam Sharma Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors. filed at Jodhpur, in his written submission claims inclusion of Village Chak 1-B-Chhoti in Municipal Council Sriganganagar which has been earlier included in municipal limits vide notification dated 19.03.2025, but is being sought to be separated vide notification dated 27.03.2025 issued by the order of DLB. The prayer is made by the counsel to quash the subsequent notification dated 27.03.2025.

40. Mr. Peerane Khan, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.11056/2025: Arbab Khan and Ors. Vs. State of



Rajasthan and Ors. filed at Jodhpur, in his written submission has challenged inclusion of Ali Khan Ki Dhani, Gram Panchayat Dedusar in a newly proposed Gram Panchayat Daulatpura. He submits that the newly proposed Gram Panchayat Daulatpura is approximately 7 kilometer away and is not connected by a proper road, and the same has been done without any form of democratic participation.

41. Mr. Jitender Singh Bhaleria, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.11010/2025: Hema Ram Vs. the State of Rajasthan and Ors. filed at Jodhpur, in his written submission has prayed to keep continue Dongre Ki Dhani in Gram Panchayat Bhaniyana, Jaisalmer, whereas the same is proposed to be included in Gram Panchayat Khinvsar-II in notice dated 07.04.2025. It is submitted that the objections were raised pointing out that the new Gram Panchayat Khinvsar is 15 kilometre away whereas the Gram Panchayat Bhaniyana is 3.5 kilometre away. It is stated that the objections were wrongly rejected, although there was a report in their favour. The power has been exercised in a colorable manner. Learned counsel also advanced the arguments commonly taken and noticed hereinabove.

42. Mr. Ikbal Khan, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.11006/2025: Jalam Singh and Anr. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors. filed at Jodhpur, in his written submission, the objection has been raised of delimitation and creation of new Gram Panchayat Harbha in place of existing Gram Panchayat Toga. It is submitted that existing Gram Panchayat Toga cannot divide the villages. The arguments as advanced earlier of being violating



of the policy and guidelines laid down vide notification dated 10.01.2025 have been reiterated by the learned counsel.

43. Mr. Ramawtar Singh Choudhary, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.9669/2025: Nema Ram Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors., and S.B. Civil Writ Petition Nos.....Item No.13, 31, 39, 57, 115, 121, 124, 149, 151, 176, 217, 228 and 239, filed at Jodhpur, in his written submission has raised similar objections relating to shifting/change of Village from one Gram Panchayat to another. He relies on **2020 (9) SCC 356 (Hari Krishan Mandir Trust Vs. State of Maharashtra)**.


44. Mr. Naman Mohnot, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.9292/2025: Ramdhan Meghwal and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors. filed at Jodhpur, in his written submission has repeated the same submission as notice above. It is submitted that the interpretation of the words ownership and control of the material resources of the community and common good under Article 39 (b) of the Constitution covers not only the population falling under the newly created revenue village, but also population left behind in the village or villages out of which new village has been created. It is submitted that the name of Village Ridmalsar Purohitan was changed by letter dated 07.10.2014 to Ridmalsar only and the action of the respondent to convert revenue Village Ridmalsar Sipahiyan and Ridmalsar Purohitan is wholly unjustified. Learned counsel submits that the creation of new Village Ridmalsar Sipahiyan is only unjustified as the separation of Village Vas Sipahiyan and Naino ka Vas and they all are situated in dimension of 1 kilometre. It is submitted that the State has to consider the willingness of the residents of the village



which is also required to be taken into consideration. Land of Village Ridmalsar Sipahiyan would be new scenario to form the new revenue village, it would affect the rights of the citizens.

45. Mr. Binja Ram Jajra, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.9209/2025: Sadik Khan and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors. filed at Jodhpur, in his written submission, the objections regarding delimitation notice on behalf of Gram Panchayat Aduri for formation of a new Gram Panchayat were raised. It was suggested that if new Gram Panchayat is required to be made, the same would be Village Gogliwala, but the District Collector vide notice dated 07.04.2025 has proposed Gram Panchayat Village Chak 2AD, Ambedkar Nagar to be formed. It is stated that several villages are located at more distant, i.e., more than 15 kilometres away and the villagers will have to visit through the existing Gram Panchayat Aduri. It is stated that the public sentiments have not been taken into consideration, the geographical and demographical aspects have also not been considered. He relies on the judgement passed in the case of **Daulat Singh and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.: D.B. Civil Writ Petition NO.5151/1999** decided on 21.01.2000, **Ram Singh and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan (2010) : S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.1027/2009** decided on 05.01.2010 and **Bhupendra Pratap Singh Rathore and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors. (2014)** and **Jorawar Singh Rathore Vs. State of Rajasthan (2024)** to support that the action was arbitrary and suffered from malice in law.


46. Mr. Rajat Arora, learned counsel appearing in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.12405/2025: Praveen Kumar Vs. State of Rajasthan



and in S.B. Civil Writ Petition Nos.11387/2025, 12580/2025 and 12732 filed at Jodhpur, filed his written submissions. Challenge has been made to the action of reorganization of Wards under Section 10 of the Act of 2009. He submits that the provisions go contrary to Section 3, 6 and 9 of the Act of 2009. He submits that neither the boundaries/limits of Municipal Council have been altered, nor there has been any change of the Census population also. Earlier, delimitation of wards for Barmer Municipal Council was conducted through gazette notification published on 27.8.2019. In view thereto, the fresh exercise of delimitation of Wards has no legal backing and appears to be on the basis of political motivation and is not based on sound reasoning. On account of redetermination and delimitation, the number of seats reserved for Women, Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, would be disturbed and there is no cogent reason for undertaking the exercise of delimitation.

47. Counsel - Mr. Manish Patel has challenged the notifications also to the extent of fixing of village headquarter. It is contended that the village as has been fixed as village headquarter is not having the required adequate facilities and the entire exercise has been conducted in violation of the principles of natural justice.


48. Counsel - Mr. Ranjeet Joshi while referring to a specific instance, has argued that village having the infrastructural facilities like Community Health Centre and Cooperative Bank has been shifted to another Gram Panchayat. Now the villagers of the petitioner's village will be deprived of adequate medical facilities and thus, action of the respondents is violative of Article 21 of the Constitution of India.



49. In support of the contention regarding statutory force of the guidelines, Senior Advocate – Mr. Manoj Bhandari argued that Section 96 of the Act of 1994 provides for delegation of powers and therefore, the guidelines being delegated legislation is having the statutory force.

(b) SUBMISSIONS OF RESPONDENTS :

50. Mr. Rajendra Prasad, learned Advocate General, has submitted with regard to the local self institutions namely the Panchayati Raj Institution and the Urban Local Bodies Institution. He submits that the said decentralization of democracy at the grass root level and insertion thereto of Schedule XI and XII with appropriate amendments provided essentially for interesting certain aspects of administration to the grassroot level. The Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 and the Rajasthan Municipalities Act, 2009 were enacted to make the existing law consisting with the constitutional amendments. It is further submitted that irrespective of the working of these institutions for decades, it has been found by the Government and reported by the State Finance Commission that they have not been made functionally and financially viable to achieve the goals as mentioned in the amended provisions of the Constitution. It has been visualised that previously the governments did not take into account the ground realities in creation and alteration of these institutions (particularly their functional and financial viability), while the local areas which are still rural are being deprived of the schemes related to rural areas and those who have actually transitioned to urban areas are being deprived of the schemes related to urban areas. Thus, to strengthen and make the



urban/rural local bodies functionally and financially efficient, the government decided to reorganise these institutions in the entire state and accordingly two different Committee of Ministers for rural and urban local bodies were constituted to finalize the proposals made in this regard by the District Collectors before the State Government issues the final notification.

51. Apart from above, it was submitted that the previous Government before the General Elections created large number of Local Bodies as well as Districts, which was apparently not conducive to the administrative efficiency and functional/financial viability. Hence, a separate committee for assessing the position of newly created Districts was also constituted, and finally 9 out of 17 newly created Districts were abolished and the position of many local bodies had to be altered.

It has further been realised that assessment of number of seats in local bodies based on earlier parameters was also not working well and therefore after analysis fresh parameters were notified resulting in delimitation of wards in all the local bodies.

The previous elections of local bodies were adversely affected by COVID-19 situation, elections were held in different phases and, therefore, the term of the local bodies were to expire on different dates spreading over a period of more than one year. As all the aforesaid exercises were being done, necessity for appointment of Administrators arose in urban as well as rural local bodies as the rural local bodies are very large in number, a policy decision as permitted under the law to appoint outgoing chairpersons as Administrators with other provisions was taken. Whereas in case of urban local bodies, only officers are permitted



to be appointed as administrators in the interregnum, such appointments were being made.

The government looking to the hardships and administrative paralysis created by holding of elections in multiple phases also decided to examine the possibility of "One State-One Election". Apart from this, as per directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, a dedicated commission for OBC reservation in these bodies has been constituted, which would submit its report.

No sooner all these exercises are complete, the mandatory exercise for allotment of seats to SC/ST/OBC/Women will be fixed and then the Election Commission after finalising the election roll, would publish the election schedule.

52. Learned Advocate General has tried to delineate various arguments advanced before this court and classified the cases as under:-

- i. Where final notification of delimitation of local bodies have been challenged.
- ii. Where during the process of delimitation, proposals have been challenged without there being any final decision.
- iii. The appointments of former chairpersons as Administrators in Rural. Local Bodies have been challenged and on the contrary petitions seeking similar appointments in municipal bodies have been sought
- iv. Writ of mandamus for holding elections in local bodies where the term has expired has been sought.
- v. Challenge to delimitation of wards of urban local bodies without there being fresh census and alteration in boundaries has been put to question.
- vi. In some petitions, removal of Pradhan by operation of law due to exclusion of rural areas from panchayat samiti has also been challenged.


53. While answering to above categories, the learned Advocate General has submitted objections *inter alia* as under:

- (i). This Court would not be having jurisdiction to hear the writ petitions in terms of Article 226 of the Constitution



of India. He relies on Article 329, Article 243O, Article 243ZG of the Constitution and Section 117 of the Act of 1994. He submits that the decision taken for delimitation once it attained finality, is not contemplated under the provisions of the Constitution and in terms of the judgements cited and referred to later on, this Court would not be entitled to consider the validity of the final notification of the delimitation.

- (ii). His further submission is with regard to non-application of principles of natural justice. It is his submission that most of the cases which have been brought for adjudication relating to the notice issued to the public giving out proposal for delimitation, were wholly premature. It is his further submission that if there is bar to interference to the final decision, it would apply to the process also. Learned Advocate General submits that the entire action/process being legislative in character, the petitioners could not have been within the purview of judicial review as legislative action would be beyond the scope of judicial review at the stage when the same has not been passed.
- (iii). He further submits that the petitions are not maintainable in absence of breach of legal/fundamental rights or failure in discharge of statutory/public duty.
- (iv). In the instant cases, petitioners have failed to show any legal right as to creation/alteration of boundaries local bodies or for that matter constituencies/wards. A bare perusal of section 3, 6, 9 and 10 of Act of 2009




and Section 9 to 14 and 101 of the Act of 1994 would show that these provisions confer jurisdiction upon the Government to establish and alter the boundaries of local bodies and specifies the composition of local bodies, and empowers the Government to determine and allot seats for election and define the boundaries of constituencies in Local Bodies. None of these provisions create any right in favour of any person for self-determination in this regard. As a matter of fact, the very nature of these actions does not permit conferment of any right in large number of electorate to propose any such actions. There is no allegation of failure to perform any statutory/public duty by the government.

- (v). The learned Advocate General submits that the guidelines which have been issued are non statutory / executive instructions laying down the procedure to guide the concerned officials who are to conduct the exercise. Neither they create any right in favour of the writ petitioners, nor any deviation made by any officer can be said to be such where the Court would strike it down. It is his submissions that the guidelines are not enforceable in law. He relies on the provisions of Section 101(1) and 101(6) of the Act of 1994 to submit that the Government has been authorized to issue orders and directions, but the learned Advocate General, in his written submissions, further submits that the provisions contained under the guidelines are



only to guide the concerned officer about the manner of making his proposal. Such guidelines could not be enforceable in law. While the provisions of Section 102 lay down the method enacting rules and if any provision is made under the Rules, the same can be enforced. He submits that as there is no prescription. It is his submission that the Government has not prescribed anything in this regard by making rules in official gazette. The guidelines alleged to have been not followed strictly by the officers would not be a reason for this Court to interfere with the Government functioning. He relies on the definition of the word "prescribed" under Section 2(19) of the Act of 1994 and Section 32(58) of Rajasthan General Clauses Act, 1955.

- (vi). The learned Advocate General, in his written submission, further submits that the petitions have been filed even before making proposal to the Government for consideration of proposal by the Government, the same deserves to be dismissed as they are based on mere apprehension or conjectures and surmises with regard to a possible decision. He further submits that when the process of taking a final decision itself is not liable to judicial review, it would apply to the decision making process also, moreso, action having a legislative character would be ousted from the scope of judicial purview.



54. In a second set of cases where the appointment of Administrator is challenged, he submits as under:

- a. Section 95 (1)(b) of the Act of 1994 and Section 322(3)(b) of the Act of 2009 provides for appointment of Administrators in the event of dissolution of local bodies. Both the provisions apply to all kinds of dissolutions under the respective Acts and are not limited to premature dissolution under section 94 of Act of 1994 or 322 of Act of 2009. Dissolution can take place under section 17 and 101 of Act of 1994 also and section 7 and 3 of Act of 2009 i.e. by efflux of term or alterations, respectively. In such situations as the office bearers and members can no more continue in office, appointment of Administrators is a necessary consequence.
- b. The holding of elections within six months applies to only premature dissolution or to new establishment of local body and not to dissolution on completion of term. By-elections in case of premature dissolution are already scheduled and were held.
- c. Section 95(1)(b) of Act of 1994 does not mandate appointment of an officer or employee of the Government, whereas section 322 (3)(b) does. In case of section 95 term used is 'such person', and therefore anyone can be so appointed. The outgoing chairperson are the most suitable person to act as 'Administrators', by virtue of being a former public representative and having experience of administration of the concerned



local body for immediate past five years. This excludes bureaucratic usurpation and applied across the board without toeing any party line.

- d. The large number of rural local bodies i.e. more than 11000 also makes it impractical to appoint an officer.
- e. This is no continuous post expiry of term, but an appointment under the Statute.
- f. The statutory regime being different, the plea of discrimination in case of municipal bodies is incorrect."

55. With regard to consequential removal of Pradhan due to the inclusion of rural area to any other urban local body, learned Advocate General relies on provisions of Section 3 (8) of the Act of 2009 and Section 101(d), 102(d) read with section 101(5A) and Section 30 and Section 36(5) of the Act of 1994. He also relies on judgements which shall be considered at the relevant place of the judgment.

56. The next challenge is with regard to the method and manner in which delimitation of Wards has been done, in case where there is absence of fresh Census or alteration of boundaries. He submits that Section 3 of the Act of 2009 would have no bearing in case of delimitation of constituencies, as the same refers to local bodies. He submits that Section 6(2) while makes fresh determination of constituencies (wards) mandatory, Section 6(1) authorises the fixation of number of seats from time to time, by notification in official Gazette. It is subject to sub-section 6(2) in the sense that irrespective of such fixation having been done, under Section 6(1), if the result of fresh Census has been undertaken, the re-fixation has to be done mandatorily.



57. He further submits that the boundaries of wards under Section 9 and 10 of the Act of 2009 may result in refixation when:

- i. result of fresh Census has come under Section 6(2).
- ii. a new municipality has been established or its boundaries have changed under Section 3.
- iii. when notification u/s 6(1) has been issued changing the number of seats.
- iv. when the Government in its discretion and for administrative efficiency and other valid reasons, decides to change the boundaries.
- v. It is worthwhile to note that on reading of Sections 3, 6, 9 and 10 together, it can be understood that there is power vested in the Government without any prohibition or restriction engrafted in these provisions.
- vi. The notification under 6(1) in this case has actually been issued for valid reasons.

58. With respect to the Public Interest Litigation, wherein mandamus has been sought for holding elections, the learned Advocate General argues that there is no dispute about the claim of the petitioners that elections of local bodies must be held before its duration is over by virtue of Article 243-E and 243-U of the Constitution. This has been held to be mandatory. However, there are exceptions carved out by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Some of them are as under:

- i. The Constitution does not provide a rigid/unalterable timeline of 5 years rather these provisions themselves contemplates premature dissolution of the local bodies.
- ii. The judgement in the case of Kishansing Tomar though clearly holds that holding of elections prior to the



expiry of duration is mandatory but on careful reading it clearly recognises in para 19 and 21 that there can be exceptional circumstances requiring postponement of elections which can be man-made also. The whole crux of the issue is that elections cannot be postponed merely by yielding of situations that may be created by vested interests, to postpone the elections. Thus, if such situation arises for bonafide reasons it would be an exception to the general rule.


- iii. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Jalgaon Municipal Council has considered these provisions and has held that the mandate of Article 243-U applies only when the nature of local bodies continues to be the same. In para 20 and 21, it has been held that any hiatus arising from conversion of a local body into another is an unavoidable event and Article 243-U cannot be applied to a case where the area of one description is converted into an area of another description. This provision means the duration of same type of municipality coming to an end and the same type of successor municipality taking over as a consequence of the term of the previous municipality coming to an end. In such situation, the argument that the whole exercise should take place before the duration of term is over, has been turned down.
- iv. This above noted judgment has been followed in the case of Pranoy Roy and the Hon'ble Apex Court allowed holding of elections after reconstitution exercise is over.



The Hon'ble Court did not approve the directions of High Court irrespective of the exercise of reconstitution being under process.

- v. The aforesaid judgments have been applied by this Hon'ble Court in the case of Satish Kumar Sharma.
- vi. In case of DMK, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that the holding of elections without competition of delimitation exercise after creation of new district is not valid.

59. Learned Advocate General further submits that from the Introductory Facts (Part -I) it is evidently clear that there is no intention to avoid elections as within short time available to Government all necessary action have been taken. Creation of democratic institutions without their functional and financial viability is of no consequence and therefore the government in its wisdom is entitled to review its situation and carry out the overall reorganisation bonafidely to make these institutions efficient. When done in the entire State the same institution as they existed previously will not be in existence and as a matter-of-fact large-scale changes have taken place in this exercise. Thus, the position of institution themselves being of the same description would be clear on competition of the exercise and therefore in view of the aforesaid judgements, Article 243-E and Article 243-U will not have any bonafide application in the first instance. Secondly, legislative/administrative exercise for strengthening of the institutions in the entire state to achieve the goals of their creation is a valid event due to which postponement of election is permissible. Thirdly, the very fact that due to effect of COVID-19,



earlier elections of local bodies were held in multiple phases and therefore resulting in multiple phases for fresh elections, which is neither a healthy situation to be perpetuated nor it would be in public interest. Thus, holding of elections simultaneously, avoiding multiple phases of elections, can also not be faulted with.

60. It is lastly argued by the learned Advocate General that it has been clearly demonstrated there have been no vested interest or malice in postponing the elections of local whose terms have expired during the course of this exercise. It is submitted that the term of several such local bodies is yet to expire. The Government is committed to expeditiously complete all these exercises and make it convenient for the election commission to hold the election for creation of efficient institutions as soon as possible.

61. The learned Advocate General, therefore, prayed that the writ petitions be dismissed and the special appeals preferred by the State, namely D.B. SAW 627/2025, D.B. SAW 628/2025 at Jaipur Bench be dismissed and D.B. SAW 831/2025 (State of Rajasthan & ors. vs. Dhanna Ram & ors.) and other connected special appeals filed at Jodhpur be allowed.

62. Learned Advocate General, in support of his submissions, has relied on various judgements such as:

Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK) Vs. Secretary, Governor's Secretariat and Ors.: (2020) 6 SCC 548

State of Maharashtra and Ors. Vs. Jalgaon Municipal Council and Ors.: (2003) 9 SCC 731

State of West Bengal and Ors. Vs. Pranoy Roy and Ors.: (2015) 16 SCC 248

Atma Singh Vs. State of Punjab: AIR 1981 SC 1173



Kishansing Tomar Vs. Municipal Corporation of the City of Ahmedabad and Ors.: (2006) 8 SCC 352

C.R. Jayasukin Vs. The Tamil Nadu State Election Commission and Anr.: Writ petition (Civil) No.1267/2018

Satish Kumar Sharma Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.: D.B. Civil Writ Petition (PIL) No.19007/2019

Hemant Narayan Rasne Vs. Commissioner and Administrator of Pune Municipal Corporation and Ors.: AIR Online 2022 SC 1405

Guddi Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.: D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.2002/2020

C.L. Satish Babu and Ors. Vs. The State of Karnataka: ILR 2020 KAR 4839

Meghraj Kothari Vs. Delimitation Commission and Ors.: AIR 1967 SC 669

State of Rajasthan Vs. Ashok Khetoliya and Anr.: (2022) 12 SCC 185

The Tulsipur Sugar Co. Ltd. Vs. The Notified Area Committee, Tulsipur.: AIR 1980 SC 882

Motan Das and Ors. Vs. The State of Rajasthan and Ors.:D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.20142/2024

Kanhaiya Lal Jhanwar Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.: 2016 3 WLC 443

Gram Panchayat Kathawala Vs. State of Rajasthan: S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.2557/1983


Mod Singh and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Anr.: S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.6132/1992

Association of Resident of Mhow (Rom) and Anr. Vs. Delimitation Commission of India and Ors.: AIR 2009 SC 3278

Lal Chand Asopa Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.: S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.4993/2025

Ram Prasad Vs. The State of Rajasthan and Anr.: AIR 1982 RAJ 271

Ayaaubkhan Noorkhan Pathan Vs. State of Maharashtra and Ors.: (2013) 4 SCC 465



J.R. Raghupathy and Ors. Vs. State of A.P. and Ors.: (1988) 4 SCC 364

Pankaj Panwar and Ors. Vs. The State of Rajasthan and Ors.: D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.8177/2025

Ram Narayan and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan: D.B. Special Appeal Writ No.1462/2019

Gani Mohd. and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.: S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.15466/2019

Gani Mohd. and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.: D.B. Special Appeal Writ No.1461/2019

Dule Singh and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.: 2019 SCC Online Raj 3209

63. In support of the contention that Gazette notification relating to delimitation of Panchayat area or formation of Constituencies in the said area or allotment of seats to the Constituencies is a legislative act in nature and therefore, it cannot be challenged, nor the Court would entertain such challenge under Articles 243-C, 243-K and 243-O of the Constitution of India, learned Advocate General has relied upon following judgments :-


State of U.P. Vs. Pradhan Singh: 1995 Supp. (2) SCC 305

Bhupendra Singh Rathore Vs. State of Rajasthan: 2015(2) WLC (Raj.) 607

Mushe Khan and Anr. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors: 2015(2) WLC 37 (D.B.)

64. It is also contended that redrawing of lottery resulting into change of reservation for some different categories under extraordinary circumstances cannot be faulted and therefore, challenge given in the writ petitions is not credible.

Further, variation of Gram Panchayat and reservation of seats or change in different categories of draw of lottery was



necessary and logical action of the State in consonance with the provisions of Section 16 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 and Rule 7 of the Election Rules of 1994, which provide for procedure for reservation. Following judgments have been relied upon in this context :

Jai Singh Vs. State of Rajasthan: 2020(2)

WLC (Raj.)10.

Virendra Singh Vs. State of Rajasthan:

2020(2) WLC (Raj.) 198

Smt. Munesh Vs. State of Rajasthan: 2021(1)

WLC (Raj.) 191

PART III – RELEVANT PROVISIONS AND ANALYSIS :

(a) CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

65. Panchayat and municipalities were included in the Constitution of India through the 73rd and 74th Amendment Acts of 1992, respectively. The 73rd Amendment added Part IX for Panchayats (rural local bodies) and the Eleventh Schedule, while the 74th Amendment added Part IX-A for Municipalities (urban local bodies). These amendments gave constitutional status to these local self-governance institutions, mandating their formation and providing a framework for their powers and functions.

66. Part IX (Article 243 to 243O) of the Constitution of India provides the Constitutional Framework for composition, constitution, functions, finance, delimitation and election etc. relating to Panchayat at village, intermediate and district level. The Eleventh Schedule of the Constitution lists 29 subjects / functions for Panchayats to handle. Following constitutional provisions of Part IX relating to Panchayat are reproduced below :-

243A. Gram Sabha.—A Gram Sabha may exercise such powers and perform such functions at the village level as the Legislature of a State may, by law, provide.

243C. Composition of Panchayats.—(1) Subject to the provisions of this Part, the Legislature of a State may, by law, make provisions with respect to the composition of Panchayats:

Provided that the ratio between the population of the territorial area of a Panchayat at any level and the number of seats in such Panchayat to be filled by election shall, so far as practicable, be the same throughout the State.

(2) All the seats in a Panchayat shall be filled by persons chosen by direct election from territorial constituencies in the Panchayat area and, for this purpose, each Panchayat area shall be divided into territorial constituencies in such manner that the ratio between the population of each constituency and the number of seats allotted to it shall, so far as practicable, be the same throughout the Panchayat area.

(3) The Legislature of a State may, by law, provide for the representation—

(a) of the Chairpersons of the Panchayats at the village level, in the Panchayats at the intermediate level or, in the case of a State not having Panchayats at the intermediate level, in the Panchayats at the district level;

(b) of the Chairpersons of the Panchayats at the intermediate level, in the Panchayats at the district level;

(c) of the members of the House of the People and the members of the Legislative Assembly of the State representing constituencies which comprise wholly or partly a Panchayat area at a level other than the village level, in such Panchayat;

(d) of the members of the Council of States and the members of the Legislative Council of the State, where they are registered as electors within—

(i) a Panchayat area at the intermediate level, in Panchayat at the intermediate level;

(ii) a Panchayat area at the district level, in Panchayat at the district level.

(4) The Chairperson of a Panchayat and other members of a Panchayat whether or not chosen by direct election from territorial constituencies in the Panchayat area shall have the right to vote in the meetings of the Panchayats.

(5) The Chairperson of—

(a) a Panchayat at the village level shall be elected in such manner as the Legislature of a State may, by law, provide; and

(b) a Panchayat at the intermediate level or district level shall be elected by, and from amongst, the elected members thereof.

243E. Duration of Panchayats, etc.—(1) Every Panchayat, unless sooner dissolved under any law for the time being in force, shall continue for five years from the date appointed for its first meeting and no longer.

(2) No amendment of any law for the time being in force shall have the effect of causing dissolution of a Panchayat at any level, which is functioning immediately before such amendment, till the expiration of its duration specified in clause (1).

(3) An election to constitute a Panchayat shall be completed—

(a) before the expiry of its duration specified in clause (1);

(b) before the expiration of a period of six months from the date of its dissolution:

Provided that where the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Panchayat would have continued is less than six months, it shall not be necessary to hold any election under this clause for constituting the Panchayat for such period.

(4) A Panchayat constituted upon the dissolution of a Panchayat before the expiration of its duration shall continue only for the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Panchayat would have continued under clause (1) had it not been so dissolved.

243G. Powers, authority and responsibilities of Panchayats.— Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, the Legislature of a State may, by law, endow the Panchayats with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as institutions of self-government and such law may contain provisions for the devolution of powers and responsibilities upon Panchayats at the appropriate level, subject to such conditions as may be specified therein, with respect to—

(a) the preparation of plans for economic development and social justice;

(b) the implementation of schemes for economic development and social justice as may be entrusted to them including those in relation to the matters listed in the Eleventh Schedule.

243K. Elections to the Panchayats.—(1) *The superintendence, direction and control of the preparation of electoral rolls for, and the conduct of, all elections to the Panchayats shall be vested in a State Election Commission consisting of a State Election Commissioner to be appointed by the Governor.*

(2) *Subject to the provisions of any law made by the Legislature of a State, the conditions of service and tenure of office of the State Election Commissioner shall be such as the Governor may by rule determine:*

Provided that the State Election Commissioner shall not be removed from his office except in like manner and on the like grounds as a Judge of a High Court and the conditions of service of the State Election Commissioner shall not be varied to his disadvantage after his appointment.

(3) *The Governor of a State shall, when so requested by the State Election Commission, make available to the State Election Commission such staff as may be necessary for the discharge of the functions conferred on the State Election Commission by clause (1).*

(4) *Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, the Legislature of a State may, by law, make provision with respect to all matters relating to, or in connection with, elections to the Panchayats.*

243O. Bar to interference by courts in electoral matters.— *Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution,—*

(a) the validity of any law relating to the delimitation of constituencies or the allotment of seats to such constituencies, made or purporting to be made under article 243K, shall not be called in question in any court;

(b) no election to any Panchayat shall be called in question except by an election petition presented to such authority and in such manner as is provided for by or under any law made by the Legislature of a State.

67. Part IX-A of the Constitution of India covering Article 243P to 243ZG provides for constitutional status to Municipalities and aims to establish a framework for governance in urban areas to promote greater participation of the elected representatives and ensures accountability. Part IX-A of the Constitution *inter alia*

provides for definition, composition, constitution, functions, delimitation and elections of the Municipality. The relevant provisions are reproduced as under :-

243P. Definitions.—*In this Part, unless the context otherwise requires,—*

- (a) "Committee" means a Committee constituted under article 243S;
- (b) "district" means a district in a State;
- (c) "Metropolitan area" means an area having a population of ten lakhs or more, comprised in one or more districts and consisting of two or more Municipalities or Panchayats or other contiguous areas, specified by the Governor by public notification to be a Metropolitan area for the purposes of this Part;
- (d) "Municipal area" means the territorial area of a Municipality as is notified by the Governor;
- (e) "Municipality" means an institution of self-government constituted under article 243Q;
- (f) "Panchayat" means a Panchayat constituted under article 243B;
- (g) "population" means the population as ascertained at the last preceding census of which the relevant figures have been published.

243Q. Constitution of Municipalities.—(1) *There shall be constituted in every State,—*

- (a) a Nagar Panchayat (by whatever name called) for a transitional area, that is to say, an area in transition from a rural area to an urban area;
- (b) a Municipal Council for a smaller urban area; and
- (c) a Municipal Corporation for a larger urban area, in accordance with the provisions of this Part:

Provided that a Municipality under this clause may not be constituted in such urban area or part thereof as the Governor may, having regard to the size of the area and the municipal services being provided or proposed to be provided by an industrial establishment in that area and such other factors as he may deem fit, by public notification, specify to be an industrial township.

(2) *In this article, "a transitional area", "a smaller urban area" or "a larger urban area" means such area as the Governor may, having regard to the population of the area, the density of the population therein, the revenue*

generated for local administration, the percentage of employment in non agricultural activities, the economic importance or such other factors as he may deem fit, specify by public notification for the purposes of this Part.

243R. Composition of Municipalities.—(1) *Save as provided in clause (2), all the seats in a Municipality shall be filled by persons chosen by direct election from the territorial constituencies in the Municipal area and for this purpose each Municipal area shall be divided into territorial constituencies to be known as wards.*

(2) *The Legislature of a State may, by law, provide—*

(a) for the representation in a Municipality of—

(i) persons having special knowledge or experience in Municipal administration;

(ii) the members of the House of the People and the members of the Legislative Assembly of the State representing constituencies which comprise wholly or partly the Municipal area;

(iii) the members of the Council of States and the members of the Legislative Council of the State registered as electors within the Municipal area;

(iv) the Chairpersons of the Committees constituted under clause (5) of article 243S:

Provided that the persons referred to in paragraph (i) shall not have the right to vote in the meetings of the Municipality;

(b) the manner of election of the Chairperson of a Municipality.

243U. Duration of Municipalities, etc.— (1) *Every Municipality, unless sooner dissolved under any law for the time being in force, shall continue for five years from the date appointed for its first meeting and no longer:*

Provided that a Municipality shall be given a reasonable opportunity of being heard before its dissolution.

(2) *No amendment of any law for the time being in force shall have the effect of causing dissolution of a Municipality at any level, which is functioning immediately before such amendment, till the expiration of its duration specified in clause (1).*

(3) *An election to constitute a Municipality shall be completed,—*

(a) before the expiry of its duration specified in clause (1);

(b) before the expiration of a period of six months from the date of its dissolution:

Provided that where the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Municipality would have continued is less than six months, it shall not be necessary to hold any election under this clause for constituting the Municipality for such period.

(4) A Municipality constituted upon the dissolution of a Municipality before the expiration of its duration shall continue only for the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Municipality would have continued under clause (1) had it not been so dissolved.

243W. Powers, authority and responsibilities of Municipalities, etc.— Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, the Legislature of a State may, by law, endow—

(a) the Municipalities with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as institutions of self-government and such law may contain provisions for the devolution of powers and responsibilities upon Municipalities, subject to such conditions as may be specified therein, with respect to—

(i) the preparation of plans for economic development and social justice;

(ii) the performance of functions and the implementation of schemes as may be entrusted to them including those in relation to the matters listed in the Twelfth Schedule;

(b) the Committees with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to carry out the responsibilities conferred upon them including those in relation to the matters listed in the Twelfth Schedule.

243ZA. Elections to the Municipalities.—(1) The superintendence, direction and control of the preparation of electoral rolls for, and the conduct of, all elections to the Municipalities shall be vested in the State Election Commission referred to in article 243K.

(2) Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, the Legislature of a State may, by law, make provision with respect to all matters relating to, or in connection with, elections to the Municipalities.

243ZG. Bar to interference by courts in electoral matters.— Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution,

(a) the validity of any law relating to the delimitation of constituencies or the allotment of seats to such constituencies, made or purporting to be made under article 243ZA shall not be called in question in any court;

(b) no election to any Municipality shall be called in question except by an election petition presented to such authority and in such manner as is provided for by or under any law made by the Legislature of a State.]

(b) PROVISIONS OF RAJ. PANCHAYATI RAJ ACT, 1994

68. Section 101 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 held as under :-

"101. Alteration in the limits of a Panchayati Raj Institution.(1) The State Government may, at any time, after one month's notice published in the prescribed manner either on its own motion or at the request made in this behalf, and by notification in the official Gazette-

(a) declare the whole or a part of any local area included within the limits of a municipality to be a Panchayat Circle; or

(b) include in a Panchayat Circle any such local area or a part thereof or, as the case may be any local area included within the limits of another Panchayat circle; or

(c) otherwise alter the limits of a Panchayat Circle by amalgamating one Panchayat Circle into another or by splitting up a Panchayat circle into two or more Panchayat Circles; or

(d) exclude the whole or a part of any local area from a Panchayat Circle, whether on its ceasing to be a rural area or, as the case may be, for its being included within the limits of another Panchayat Circle.

(2) Upon any action being taken under Sub-Section (1), the State Government shall, notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or any other law for the time being in force, by an order published in the Official Gazette, make provision for the following, namely: -

(a) that, in a case falling under Clause (a) of that Sub-section, a Panchayat shall be established for the local area declared to be a Panchayat Circle; or

(b) that, in a case falling under Clause (b) of that Sub-section, the election of the members for the additional local area shall be held; or

(c) that, in a case falling under Clause (c) of that sub-section the existing Panchayats shall stand dissolved and new Panchayats shall be constituted -in accordance with the provisions of this Act within a period of six months from the appointed day; or

(d) that, in a case falling under Clause (d), the Panchayat shall stand dissolved or, as the case may be, the members who, in the opinion of the State Government, represent the local area excluded from the Panchayat Circle shall stand removed;

Provided that for so long as a Panchayat or a new Panchayat is not established under Clause (a) or, as the case may be, under Clause (c), all power and duties of the Panchayat shall be exercised and performed by such administrator as the State Government may appoint in this behalf:

Provided further that no act of a Panchayat shall be deemed invalid by reason of any vacancy of the members referred to in clause (b).

(3) Upon the exclusion of any local area of a municipality and its declaration as or, as the case may be inclusion in, a Panchayat Circle under Sub-Section (1) -

(a) such area shall cease to be a municipality;

(b) the members of the board representing the area of the municipality so declared or included in a Panchayat Circle shall vacate their respective offices but without prejudice to their eligibility for election to the Panchayat to be constituted for such area or, as the case may be, the Panchayat, in the area whereof, such area is included;

(c) the whole of the assets testing in, and of the liabilities subsisting against, the municipality so declared to be a Panchayat or, in case where only a part of a municipality is included in, or declared to be a Panchayat, such portion of the said assets and liabilities as the State Government may direct, shall develop upon the Panchayat declared for such area or upon the Panchayat in which such area of the municipality is included;

(d) until new rules, notification order and bye-laws are made or issued under this Act and unless the State Government otherwise directs, all rules, notifications, orders and bye-laws applicable:-

(i) to the Panchayat in which such area is included; and

(ii) where the whole or a part of a municipality is declared to be a Panchayat to the area of the Panchayat Samiti which

shall, by reason of the concerned area falling in the block of such Panchayat Samiti, have jurisdiction on the area so declared to be a Panchayat,

shall continue to apply to the area so included or declared;

(e) the Panchayat so established by inclusion of any area of a municipality thereon or by the declaration of a municipality as a Panchayat shall levy or continue to levy such of the taxes as are lawfully imposed under this Act;

(f) any such area shall cease to be subject to all rules, notifications, order and bye-laws made under the Rajasthan Municipality Act, 1959 (Rajasthan Act 38 of 1959); and

(g) the Panchayat in which such area is included or the Panchayat which is declared for such area and the Panchayat Samiti and Zila Parishad respectively of the Block and District, in which the area so included or declared falls, shall exercise jurisdiction over such area and the municipality in which such area was included or, as the case may be, the municipality which was established for such area shall cease to function therein.

(4) When any local area ceases to be a Panchayat and is included within the local limits of the jurisdiction of some other local authority, the Panchayat Fund and other property and rights vesting in the Panchayat shall vest in such other local authority and the liabilities of the Panchayat shall be the liabilities of such other local authority.

(5) When any local area is excluded from a Panchayat Circle and included in another Panchayat Circle, such portion of the Panchayat Fund and other property vested in the Panchayat of the first mentioned Circle shall vest in, and such portion of the liabilities thereof shall be the liabilities of the other Panchayat as the State Government may, after consulting both the Panchayats, declare, by notification in the Official Gazette:

Provided that the provisions of this Sub-section shall not apply in any case where the circumstances, in the opinion of the State Government, render undesirable the transfer of any portion of the Panchayat Fund or properties or liabilities.

[(5A) When it is considered necessary so to do, whether as a consequence of an action taken under Sub-Section (1) or otherwise, the State Government may alter the limits of a Panchayat Samiti or a Zila Parishad area and every such case of alteration the provisions contained in the foregoing sub-sections shall mutatis mutandis apply.]

(6) *The State Government may, for the purpose of the foregoing sub-sections, make such orders and give such directions as it may consider necessary.*

(7) *Save as otherwise provided in this section its provisions shall have effect, notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or the Rajasthan Municipalities Act, 1959 (Rajasthan Act 38 of 1959) or any other law for the time being in force.*

Explanation. - In this section "appointed day" means the day from which a change referred to in Sub-Section (1), takes place."

69. The scheme of Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 envisage the Panchayat at Village level, Panchayat Samiti at Block level and Zila parishad at District level.

70. Establishment of Panchayat is provided under Section 9, which read as under:

"9. Establishment of Panchayat.- (1) *The State Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, declare any local area, comprising a village or a group of villages not included in a municipality or a cantonment board constituted under any law for the time being in force to be Panchayat Circle and for every local area declared as such there shall be a Panchayat.*

(2) *Every Panchayat shall, by the name notified in the Official Gazette, be a body corporate having perpetual succession and common seal and shall, subject to any restrictions and conditions imposed by or under this Act or any other law, have power to acquire, by purchase, gift, or otherwise, to hold, administer and transfer property, both movable and immovable, and to enter any contract and shall, by the said name, sue and be sued.*

(3) *The State Government may, at any time, after one month's notice published in the prescribed manner either on its own motion or at the request of the Panchayat or of the residents of the Panchayat Circle, and by notification in the Official Gazette, change the name [or place of office] of any such Panchayat."*

71. Establishment of Panchayat Samiti is provided under Section 10, which read as under:

"10. Establishment of Panchayat Samiti- (1) *The State Government may, by notification in the official Gazette, declare any local area within the same district to be a block and for every block declared as such there shall be a Panchayat Samiti having jurisdictions, save as otherwise provided in this Act, over the entire block excluding such portions of the block as are*

included in a municipality or a cantonment board constituted under any law for the time being in force:

Provided that a Panchayat Samiti may have its office in any area comprised within the excluded portion of the Panchayat Samiti.

(2) Every Panchayat Samiti shall, by the name notified in the Official Gazette, be a body corporate having perpetual succession and common seal and shall, subject to any restrictions and conditions imposed by or under this Act or any other law, have power to acquire, by purchase, gift or otherwise, to hold, administer and transfer property, both movable and immovable, and to enter into any contract and shall, by the said name, sue and be sued.

(3) The State Government may, at any time, after one month's notice published in the prescribed manner either on its own motion or at the request of the Panchayat Samiti or of the residents of any area within the block of the Panchayat Samiti, and by notification in the Official Gazette, change the name [or place of office] of any such Panchayat Samiti."

72. Establishment of Zila Parishad is provided under Section 11, which read as under:

"11. Establishment of Zila Parishad. (1) *For every district, there shall be a Zila Parishad having jurisdiction, save as otherwise provided in this Act, over the entire district, excluding such portions of the district as are included in a municipality or a cantonment board constituted under any law for the time being in force:*

Provided that a Zila Parishad may have its office in any area within the excluded portion of the district

(2) Every Zila Parishad shall bear the name of the district for which it is constituted and shall be a body corporate having perpetual succession and a common seal and shall, subject to any restrictions and conditions imposed by or under this Act or any other law, have power to acquire, by purchase, gift, or otherwise, to hold, administer, and transfer property, both movable and immovable, and to enter into any contract, and shall, by the said name, sue and be sued."

73. Composition of Panchayat is provided under Section 12, which read as under:

"12. Composition of a Panchayat.- (1) *A panchayat shall consist of:-*

(a) a Sarpanch; and

(b) directly elected Panchas from as many wards as are determined under Sub-section (2).

[(2) The State Government shall, by such rules as may be framed on this behalf, determine the number of the wards, not being less than five for each Panchayat Circle, and thereupon so divide the Panchayat Circle into single-member wards that the population of each ward is, so far as practicable, the same throughout the Panchayat Circle.]"

74. From the perusal of the aforesaid provisions, it is apparent that it is the State Government which establishes a Panchayat as laid down in Section 9. The State Government would also have a power to change the name or place or office of any Panchayat. Similarly, the power is available to the State relating to Panchayat Samiti as well as to the Zila Parishad.

75. As per the aforesaid provisions, it is apparent that in a Panchayat, there would be one Sarpanch and Panch and several Panchas. The Panchayat represents the wards which may be determined for each Panchayat circle and the number of Wards would be determined by the State Government. Thus, it is the administrative discretion of the State to lay down the number of wards in a Panchayat circle, which would not be less than 5. Therefore, in a Panchayat there has to be at least 5 Panchas.

Rules 3 and 4 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Election Rules, 1994 lays down the method and manner of formation of Wards and Constituencies for the Panchayat Circle at the Zila Parishad and Panchayat Samities. In terms of Rule 3(5) while dividing a Panchayat Samiti area into constituency under Section 13, officer authorised by the Government shall as far as practicable, place contiguous Panchayats in a constituency; provided that a whole village comprising a part of Panchayat circle may be placed in a different constituency if it is necessary to do so to distribute the population in the constituencies as far as practicable equally. The



power thus, has been provided to the Government to divide a Panchayat Samiti area.

76. Rule 4 provides for publication of wards and constituencies which read as under:

"Rule 4. Publication of wards of constituencies:-

(1) The wards or constituencies formed under Rule 3 shall be notified by the Officer authorised by the Government by affixing statement thereof on the notice board of the office of the District Election Officer (Panchayats) and the office of Panchayat Samiti in respect of constituencies for a Parishad: on the notice board of the District Election Officer (Panchayats), the Panchayat Samiti of the Panchayat in respect of constituencies for Panchayat Samiti, and on the notice board of the Panchayat and a conspicuous place in every village of the Panchayat in respect of wards of the Panchayats.

(2) Any adult inhabitant of the Panchayat area/constituency may, if he objects to anything contained in the Statement affixed under Sub-rule (1) pertaining to the ward or constituency related to the Panchayati Rai Institution of which he is a voter, submit his objection in writing to the Officer authorised by the Government within seven days from the date of affixing of such statement.


(3) All objections received under Sub-rule (2) shall be affixed on the notice board of the office of the Officer authorised by the Government on the date of their receipt. After the time prescribed for receipt of objections is over, the Officer authorised by the Government under Rule 4 (2) shall forward all the statement of wards/constituencies formed under Rule 3 and the objections, if any, received under Rule 4 (2) alongwith his comments thereon to the State Government.

(4) The State Government, or any Officer authorised by it, shall thereon consider the objections and other material before it, including the comments of the Officer authorised by the State Government under Sub-rule (2), and shall decide the objections and thereafter amend, if necessary, the statements accordingly, finally determine the wards and constituencies and shall notify the same by affixing the final statement of wards/constituencies at the following places, namely:-

(a) On the notice board of the office of District Election Officer (Panchayats) and the office of the Panchayat Samiti in respect of constituencies for Zila Parishad,

(b) On the notice board of the District Election Officer (Panchayats) and the notice board of Panchayat Samiti and Panchayats in respect of constituencies of Panchayat Samiti,

(c) On the notice board of the Panchayat and a conspicuous place in every village of the Panchayat in respect of wards."



77. Thus, we notice that a voter adult inhabitant of a Panchayat has a right to submit his objections and the officer authorised by the State Government in terms of Sub Rule (2) would decide and finally determine the Wards.

Similarly, a Panchayat Samiti having population of one lack shall consist of at least 15 constituencies and would increase by two on every fifteen thousand or part thereof increased in the population as provided under Panchayati Raj Election Rule 1994.

The reservation of seats is provided under Section 15 of the Act of 1994 for the Scheduled Casts, Scheduled Tribes, Backward Classes and Women. Their percentage being in proportion to the total number of seats as well as to the population of such castes or tribes in that Panchayati Raj institutions. The seats of backward classes would not exceed 21 to the maximum, provided that at least one seat shall be reserved for backward classes depending upon the percentage of population of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes of the said reserved seats of Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes or Backward Classes, at least 50%, i.e., not less than half would be reserved for Woman candidates in the total number of seats to be filled by direct election in any Panchayati Raj institution. The Chairpersons of the Panchayati Raj Institutions namely, Sarpanch, Pradhan and Pramukh are also subject to the reservation on similar lines.

Section 30 of the Act of 1994 lays down the terms of office of Members, Chairpersons and Deputy Chairpersons which provides that they would hold the office during the term of the concerned Panchayati Raj Institution. Section 30 of Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 provides as under:

"30. Term of office of members, Chairpersons and Deputy Chairpersons.- Except as otherwise provided in this Act -

(a) the members and the Chairpersons of a Panchayati Raj Institution shall hold office during the term of the concerned Panchayati Raj Institution; and

(b) the Deputy Chairperson of a Panchayati Raj Institution shall hold office as long as he continues to be a member of the concerned Panchayati Raj Institution"

78. Section 95 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 provides the consequences of dissolution of a Panchayati Raj institutions, which read as under:

"95. Consequences of dissolution.- (1) When a Panchayati Raj Institution is dissolved under this Act, the following consequences shall ensure:-

(a) all the members of the Panchayati Raj Institution including the chairperson shall, on the date of dissolution vacate their respective offices but without prejudice to their eligibility for re-election or re-appointment.

(b) all powers and duties of the Panchayati Raj Institution shall, during the period of dissolution, be exercised and performed by such administrator as the State Government may appoint in this behalf; and

(c) all property vested in the Panchayati Raj Institution shall, during the period of dissolution, vest in the Government.


(2) If it shall not be possible to reconstitute the Panchayati Raj Institution within the time specified in Clause (b) of Sec-Section (3), of Section 17 because of any stay by any competent Court or authority on any general election to the Panchayati Raj Institution concerned and the proceedings consequent thereof the consequences specified in Clauses (b) and (c) of Sub-Section (1) shall follow.

(3) An order of dissolution made under Section 94 together with a statement of the reasons thereof shall be laid before the House of the State Legislature, as soon as may be, after it has been made."

79. Section 99 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 provides as under:

"99. Appointment of officers and staff by Government.- For the discharge of such functions in regard to the administration of Panchayats as are provided for in this Act or as may be prescribed thereunder, the State Government may appoint an Officer-in-charge of Panchayats with such designation as it may from time to time notify and such other

subordinate officers and staff as the State Government may deem necessary."



80. Thus, in terms of Section 101 of the Act of 1994, the State Government is authorized to alter the limits of the Panchayati Raj Institutions, as noticed above by inclusion/exclusion. Upon such exclusion of the whole or part of Panchayat Circle or on account of inclusion in another Panchayat Circle, in terms of Section-101 Clause-2 Sub-clause (d), the Panchayat shall stand dissolved or, as the case may be, the members who, represent the local area which has been excluded from the Panchayat Circle shall stand removed. The provision is a deeming clause and upon on such inclusion or exclusion, the Rules, notifications, orders and bylaws will continue to apply unless new Rules are framed to such area so included or declared.

81. We further notice that Clause-(5A) empowers the State Government to alter the limits of Panchayat Samiti or Zila Parishad area where it is expedient to do so as a consequence of above and State Government would pass such necessary orders or directions as it may considered necessary in terms of Clause-(6). However, Section 102, Clause-(2), Sub-clauses (b) and (c) of the Act of 1994 empowers the State Government to frame such Rules which may provide any matter which empowers the State Government or for the guidance of the Panchayati Raj Institutions and servants and authorities in relation to the subject connected for carrying out the provisions of the Act.

82. Section 117 of the Act of 1994 lays down a bar of jurisdiction of civil courts.



83. Apart from above, it would be necessary to notice that under the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Election Rules, 1994 for each Panchayat, electoral rolls are to be prepared which are ward of constituency-wise. Rule 11 of the Rules of 1994 provides as under:

"Rule 11. Preparation of electoral rolls.- (1) *The Commission shall subject to the provisions of Section 18, cause to be prepared a ward or constituency-wise electoral roll in Hindi in Devnagri script for each Panchayati Raj Institution.*


(2)(a) *The names of electors in a roll for a ward in the case of a Panchayat Circle shall be arranged in the order of the serial number of houses as may be compromised in each ward.*

(b) *The electoral roll for constituency of Panchayat Samiti or Zila Parishad, shall consist of the electoral rolls for the wards or part thereof of Panchayat Circles which are comprised within the constituency concerned, which will be arranged Panchayat Circle-wise on the basis of list arranged under Clause (a) of this sub-rule.*

(3) *Whenever limits of wards or constituencies of a Panchayat Circle or Panchayat Samiti or Zila Parishad are revised or when a Panchayat Circle or Panchayat Samiti or Zila Parishad is constituted or re-constituted, such roll may be prepared afresh and shall contain names of all persons entitled to be registered after enquiry as electors under the Act, as far as possible.*

(4) *For the purpose of preparing any roll or deciding any claim or objection to a roll, the Electoral Registration Officers and any person employed by him, shall have access to any register of births and deaths and to the admission register of any educational institution and it shall be the duty of every person in charge of any such register to give to the said officer or person such information and such extracts from the said register as he may require."*

84. Thus, wherever limits of wards are revised, the electoral roll is prepared afresh after examining the persons who would be registered as electors. Thus, if there is a change of limits of a Ward, the concerned elector also losses a right of registration in the fresh electoral list and therefore, the claims and objections with regard to publication of draft rolls is provided under the said Chapter-III of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Election Rules, 1994.



85. Rule 16 of the Rules of 1994 provides for deletion of names of such persons who cease to remain as ordinarily resident of that particular area on account of change of the Wards or constituencies. Thus, the rules provided for revision of electoral rolls through an intricate procedure, whereafter the election process commences.

(c) PROVISIONS OF RAJ. MUNICIPALITIES ACT, 2009

86. For the purpose of adjudication of the issues involved in the present bunch of matters, following relevant provisions of Act of 2009 are quoted below :

"3. Delimitation of Municipalities. - (1) The State Government may, by notification published in the Official Gazette, declare any local area not included within the limits of a Municipality to be a Municipality, or include any such area in a Municipality, or exclude any local area from a Municipality, or otherwise alter the limits of any Municipality and when

(a) any local area is declared as, or included in, a Municipality, or

(b) any local area is excluded from a Municipality, or

(c) the limits of a Municipality are otherwise altered, by amalgamation of one Municipality into another or by splitting up a Municipality into two or more Municipalities, or

(d) any local area ceases to be a Municipality, the State Government may, notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or any other law for the time being in force, by an order published in the Official Gazette provide,-

(i) in a case falling under clause (a), that the election of the members for the area or the additional area shall be held within a period of six months from the appointed day;

(ii) in a case falling under clause (b), that the members who in the opinion of the State Government represent the area excluded from the Municipality shall be removed;

(iii) in a case falling under clause (c), that until the term of the Municipality in which another Municipality is amalgamated expires under this Act, the Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and members of such another Municipality shall be deemed to be the members of the Municipality in which such another Municipality is

amalgamated and where a Municipality is split into two or more Municipalities, that the members representing the area included in the newly constituted Municipality shall be deemed to be the members of such new Municipality and such new Municipality shall continue, unless dissolved sooner, until original Municipality would have continued;

(iv) in a case falling under clause (d), that the Municipality shall be dissolved.

4. Power to exempt municipal board from operation of any provisions of the Act unsuited thereto. -

(1) The State Government may, by notification, and for reasons to be recorded in writing, exempt any Municipal Board from the operation of any of the provisions of this Act considered unsuited thereto, and, thereupon, the said provisions shall not apply to such Municipal Board until such provisions are applied thereto by notification.

(2) While a notification under sub-Section (1) remains in force, the State Government may make rules consistent with the provisions of this Act in respect of any matter within the purview of such provisions from operation of which the Municipal Board is exempted.

6. Composition of Municipality:-

(1) *Subject to the provisions contained in the succeeding sub-Sections, but save as provided in the following provisions of this sub-Section, all seats in a Municipality shall be filled by persons chosen by direct election from the territorial constituencies known as wards, the number of such seats, not being less than thirteen, being fixed by the State Government from time to time by notification in the Official Gazette:*

(a)... ..

(b)... ..


(2) *Upon the completion of each census after the establishment of the Municipality, the number of seats shall be re-determined by the State Government by notification in the Official Gazette on the basis of the population of the municipal area as ascertained at the latest census:*

Provided that the determination of seats as aforesaid shall not affect the existing composition of the Municipality until the expiry of its term.

(3) *... ..*

9. Division into wards. - *(1) For purposes of elections, a Municipality shall be divided into such number of wards as is equal to the total number of seats fixed for the Municipality under sub-Section (1) of Section 6.*

(2) The representation of each ward shall be on the basis of the population of that ward and shall, as far as possible, be in the same proportion as the total number of seats for the Municipality bear to its population.



10. Determination of wards. - (1) The State Government shall by order determine,

(a) the wards into which each Municipality shall, for the purpose of its elections, be divided;

(b) the extent of each ward;

(c) the number of seats, if any, reserved for members of the Scheduled Castes or, as the case may be, Scheduled Tribes and for women members of such castes and tribes and for members of the Backward Classes and women members thereof; and

(d) the number of wards for women candidates.

(2) The seats reserved for Scheduled Castes or, as the case may be, for Scheduled Tribes and for the Backward Classes and for women may be allotted by rotation to different wards in such manner as may be prescribed.

(3) The State Government shall carry out the determination of the boundaries of the wards and allocation of seats reserved in favour of the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, the Backward Classes and women among the wards having regard to the provisions of Section 6 and also to the following provisions, namely:

(a) all wards shall, as far as practicable, be geographically compact areas;

(b) wards which are reserved for the Scheduled Castes or Scheduled Tribes shall be distributed to different parts of the municipal areas where the proportion of the population of such castes or tribes, as the case may be, is comparatively large; and

(c) the numbering of wards shall start from the north-west corner of the local area of a Municipality.

(4) The draft of the order under sub-Section (1) shall be published for filing objections thereto within a period of not less than seven days and a copy of the same shall be sent to the Municipality concerned for comments.

(5) The State Government shall consider any objection and the comments received under sub-Section (4) and the draft order shall, if necessary, be amended, altered or modified accordingly, and thereupon it shall become final.

11. Election to the Municipality. -

(1) The superintendence, direction and control of the preparation of electoral rolls for, and the conduct of, all elections to the Municipality shall be vested in the State Election Commission.

(2) An election to constitute a Municipality shall be completed

(i) before the expiry of its duration specified in Section 7;

(ii) before the expiration of a period of six months from the date of its dissolution:

Provided that where the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Municipality would have continued is

less than six months, it shall not be necessary to hold any election under this clause for constituting the Municipality for such period.

(3) For the aforesaid purpose the State Government shall on the recommendation of the State Election Commission call upon all the wards to elect members, in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the rules and orders made thereunder, on such date or dates as may be specified in the notification.

(4) When a new Municipality is established, it shall, as far as may be, be constituted in accordance with the provisions of this Act relating to general election to a Municipality.

(5) The State Government shall, when so requested by the State Election Commission, make available to the Commission such staff as may be necessary for discharge of the functions conferred on the State Election Commission by sub-Section (1).

322. Power of Government to dissolve Municipality in case of incompetency or having less than two third elected members. -

(1) If at any time the State Government is satisfied that the Municipality is not competent to perform, or persistently makes default in the performance of the duties imposed on it by or under this Act or otherwise by law, or has exceeded, or abused its powers, the State Government may, by an order published along with the reasons thereof, in the Official Gazette, declare the Municipality to be incompetent or in default, or to have exceeded or abused its powers, as the case may be, and may dissolve such Municipality as from a date to be specified in the order of dissolution:

Provided that no action shall be taken under this sub-Section unless the Municipality through its Chairperson has been afforded a reasonable opportunity of submitting an explanation and of being heard, if the Municipality so desires:

Provided further that no order under this sub-Section shall be passed

(i) unless the State Government has drawn up a statement setting out distinctly the charges against the Municipality and sent the same for inquiry in the prescribed manner and findings to a Tribunal consisting of a Chairman and not less than two members, constituted in the prescribed manner, or

(ii) otherwise than in conformity with such findings.

Explanation.- *If for any reason the number of vacancies in a Municipality exceeds two-thirds of the total number of seats, the Municipality shall be deemed to be not competent to perform the duties imposed on it by or under this Act.*

(2) The State Government shall dissolve the Municipality if at any time the number of its elected members falls short of two third of its total members.

(3) When a Municipality is dissolved under sub-Section (1) or any other provision of this Act, the following consequences shall ensue:

(a) all members of the Municipality including the Chairperson and the Vice-Chairperson shall, on the date specified in the order of dissolution, vacate their respective offices but without prejudice to their eligibility for re-election or re-appointment; and

(b) all powers and duties of the Municipality shall, during the period of dissolution, be exercised and performed by such officer as an Administrator as the State Government appoints in this behalf.

(4) An election to constitute a Municipality shall be completed before the expiration of a period of six months from the date of its dissolution:

Provided that where the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Municipality would have continued is less than six months, it shall not be necessary to hold any election under this sub-Section for constituting the Municipality for such period.

(5) A Municipality constituted upon the dissolution of Municipality before the expiration of its duration shall continue only for the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Municipality would have continued under Section 7 had it not been so dissolved.

(6) An order of dissolution made under this Section together with statement of the reasons thereof shall be laid before the House of the State Legislature, as soon as may be, after it has been made."

The contentions of the respective parties are to be analysed in view of the relevant constitutional and statutory provisions as quoted above.

PART IV – ANALYSIS & REASONING

a) CATEGORIZATION OF PETITIONS

87. The common thread running through all the writ petitions concerns the delimitation of Panchayati Raj Institutions and Municipalities, which has led to the inclusion or exclusion of Gram Panchayats or municipal areas and the resulting consequences, including the postponement of elections pending such delimitation.



Based on the reliefs sought in these petitions, we deemed it appropriate to classify them into different categories, group the writ petitions and special appeals accordingly, and adjudicate the matters falling in each such category, together. For the ease of adjudication, present bunch of writ petitions / special appeals have been clubbed broadly in following categories :-

- i. Petitions challenging final notifications issued under Section 101 of the Act of 1994;
- ii. Petitions challenging final notifications issued under Section 3 of the Act of 2009;
- iii. Petitions challenging notices issued under Section 101 of the Act of 1994 inviting objections relating to delimitation and the process adopted in pursuance thereof;
- iv. Petitions challenging removal of elected representatives on account of dissolution of Gram Panchayats;
- v. Petitions challenging order of removal of representative members of Municipal Bodies on account of delimitation;
- vi. Petitions challenging appointment of the Administrator on completion of tenure of the Local Self Institutions;
- vii. Petitions challenging process of conducting delimitation of territorial constituencies / wards in Municipal areas without their being any inclusion or exclusion of territories of existing local bodies / without change of census;
- viii. Petitions seeking directions for holding of elections of Local Self Institutions;

88. In ***D.B. Special Appeal Writ No.831/2025: State of Rajasthan and Ors. Vs. Dhanna Ram and Ors.***, challenge has


been given to the order dated 23.05.2025 passed in **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.8576/2025 (Dhanna Ram and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors.)**, wherein learned Single Judge has directed as under:

"7. Meanwhile, the competent high-level Committee of the State is directed to consider the objections qua all the writ petitions pending here, list whereof shall be supplied to them by the office of Advocate General. While doing so, the Committee shall decide the proposals so sent by the Collectors in terms of the Guidelines dated 10.01.2025 and other guidelines issued from time to time so also the issues/questions, which this Court has highlighted hereinabove."

89. In **D.B. Civil Writ Petition (PIL) No. 1285/2025 (Giriraj Singh Devanda Vs. State of Rajasthan)**, the prayer has been made seeking quashing of notification dated 16.01.2025 and directing the Election Commission to immediately declare and conduct the election programme for all Gram Panchayats in the State of Rajasthan where the tenure has concluded and commence the election process without delay and further directed the Government Officials such as Secretary Panchayat, BDO to be appointed as Administrators until the election programme is announced.

90. In **D.B. Civil Writ Petition (PIL) No. 4686/2025 (Sanyam Lodha vs. State of Rajasthan & ors.)**, the prayer has been made for directing the Election Commission to immediately declare and conduct the election programme for all Municipalities in the State of Rajasthan.

The category-wise analysis, reasoning and conclusion of the bunch of writ petitions / special appeals is as follow :-



PART (A) – PETITIONS CHALLENGING FINAL
NOTIFICATION OF DELIMITATION ISSUED
UNDER SECTION 101 OF THE ACT OF 1994 /
SECTION 3 OF THE ACT OF 2009

91. In various writ petitions, final notification issued under Section 101 of the Act of 1994 as well as under Section 3 of the Act of 2009 regarding delimitation of Panchayat area as well as delimitation of Municipal area respectively, are challenged on various grounds. Apart from countering the averments made in the writ petition on merits, various preliminary objections were raised by the respondent regarding maintainability of the said writ petitions. The learned Advocate General submitted that in view of the constitutional as well as statutory bar of interference, the writ petitions against the final notification of delimitation are not maintainable. In view of the rival submissions, following questions emanates for adjudication by this Court.

- 1. Whether the writ petitions are maintainable against the final notifications of Delimitation, in view of the Bar of interference provided under Constitution of India as well as provisions of respective statutes?**
- 2. What is the scope of judicial review under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in the matters relating to Delimitation notifications?**
- 3. Whether the guidelines issued by the State Government for undertaking process of**

delimitation are statutory in nature and therefore, required to be followed strictly?

- 4. Whether the petitioners have locus to maintain the writ petition challenging the delimitation notification?**
- 5. Whether the State Government is under obligation to decide the objections submitted by the petitioners regarding the proposed delimitation while adhering to the principles of *audi alteram partem*?**
- 6. Whether the writ petitions challenging the validity of delimitation notifications issued under Section 101 of the Act of 1994 and Section 3 of the Act of 2009 are sustainable in view of the grounds raised therein?**

Analysis of Question No.1 & 2:

92. Since Question No.1 & 2 are corollary to each other, hence the same are considered and decided concurrently.

Questioning the maintainability of the bunch of writ petitions challenging the Notifications issued under Section 3 of the Act of 2009 as well as notifications issued under Section 101 of the Act of 1994, learned Advocate General, argued that in view of the Constitutional Bar provided under Article 243-O and 243-ZG, the said writ petitions are not maintainable. It is further argued that while maintaining the constitutional spirit respective Bar of interference is also provided under Section 117 of the Act of 1994 as well as Section 30 of the Act of 2009 in the matters of



Delimitation. Thus, once a decision regarding delimitation attains finality, its validity cannot be questioned. Reliance is placed on Articles 329, 243-O, and 243-ZG of the Constitution of India as well as Section 117 of the Act of 1994 and Section 30 of the Act of 2009.

93. Articles 329, 243-O, and 243-ZG of the Constitution of India which are reproduced below :-

329. Bar to interference by courts in electoral matters

[Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution]

2(a) the validity of any law relating to the delimitation of constituencies or the allotment of seats to such constituencies, made or purporting to be made under article 327 or article 328, shall not be called in question in any court;

(b) no election to either House of Parliament or to the House or either House of the Legislature of a State shall be called in question except by an election petition presented to such authority and in such manner as may be provided for by or under any law made by the appropriate Legislature.

243-O : Bar to interference by courts in electoral matters

Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution—

*(a) **the validity of any law relating to the delimitation of constituencies** or the allotment of seats to such constituencies, made or purporting to be made under article 243K, **shall not be called in question in any court;***

(b) no election to any Panchayat shall be called in question except by an election petition presented to such authority and in such manner as is provided for by or under any law made by the Legislature of a State.

243ZG : Bar to interference by courts in electoral matters —

Notwithstanding anything in this Constitution—

*(a) **the validity of any law relating to the delimitation of constituencies or the allotment of seats** to such constituencies, made or purporting to be made under article 243ZA **shall not be called in question in any court;***

(b) no election to any Municipality shall be called in question except by an election petition presented to such

authority and in such manner as is provided for by or under any law made by the Legislature of a State.

Section 117 of the Act of 2001 reads as under :-

Section 117. Bar to interference by Courts in certain matters.-

Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act- (a) the validity of any law relating to the delimitation of constituencies or wards made or purporting to be made under this Act, shall not be called in question in any Court, and (b) no election to any Panchayati Raj Institution shall be called in question except by an election petition presented to such authority and in such manner as is provided for by or under this Act.

Section 30 of the Act of 2009 is reproduced as under :-

"30. Jurisdiction of civil courts in electoral matters. - (1) No civil Court shall have jurisdiction to entertain or adjudicate upon any question relating to the delimitation of wards, the allotment of seats to such wards, preparation of electoral rolls or conduct of election.

(2) No election to any Municipality shall be called in question except by an election petition presented in accordance with the provisions of this Act."

94. Learned Advocate General also contended that law in this regard is well settled and the Hon'ble Apex Court as well as this Court in various authoritative pronouncements have repeatedly held that the orders / notifications of Delimitation are in the nature of conditional legislation, thus the final notifications issued for Delamination having the effect of law made by the Parliament / State Legislature and validity of the same cannot be called in question in any Court. In view of the judgments cited and referred to subsequently, it was contended that this Court would not have the jurisdiction to examine the validity of the final notification of delimitation.

95. While referring to judgment passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Meghraj Kothari vs Delimitation Commission; AIR 1967 SC 669***, learned Advocate General

stated that final notification of Delimitation is having legislative character, thus, not open for interference by this Court

23. *The power of the delegate is only to make an order under s. 3. Once the delegate has made that order its power is exhausted. Section 6 then steps in wherein the Parliament has declared that as soon as such an order comes into being that will have effect notwithstanding any inconsistency therewith contained in any enactment other than this Act."*

24. *Similarly it may be said here that once the Delimitation Commission has made orders under Sections 8 and 9 and they have been published under s. 10(1), the orders are to have the same effect as if they were law made by Parliament itself.*

31. *In this case it must be held that the order under sections [8](#) and [9](#) published under Section 10(1) the Delimitation Commission Act were to make a complete set of rules which would govern the re-adjustment of number of seats and the delimitation of constituencies.*

32. *In this case the powers given by the Delimitation Commission Act and the work of the Commission would be wholly nugatory unless the Commission as a result of its deliberations and public sittings were in a position to re-adjust the number of seats in the House of the People or the total number of seats to be assigned to the Legislative Assembly with reservation for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and the delimitation of constituencies. It was the will of Parliament that the Commission could by order publish its proposals which were to be given effect to in the subsequent election and as such its order as published in the notification of the Gazette of India or the Gazette of the State was to be treated as law on the subject.*

33. *In the instant case the provision of section 10(4) of the Act puts orders under Sections 8 and 9 as published under section 10(1) in the same street as a law made by Parliament itself which, as we have already said, could only be done under Article 327, and consequently the objection that the notification was not to be treated as law cannot be given effect to. In the result the appeal fails and is dismissed with costs.*

96. In case of the judgment passed in ***The Tulsipur Sugar Company Ltd. Vs. The Notified Area Committee***



Tulsipur, reported in **AIR 1980 SC 882**, the Hon'ble Apex Court, in para 18 has held that Delimitation notification declaring an area as urban area is in the nature of conditional legislation. Para 18 reads as under :-

"18. We are, therefore, of the view that a notification issued under Section 3 of the Act which has the effect of making the Act applicable to a geographical area is in the nature of a conditional legislation and that it cannot be characterised as a piece of subordinate legislation. In view of the foregoing, we hold that the contention of the plaintiff that the declaration made by the Station Government under Section 3 of the Act declaring the area in which the sugar factory of the Tulsipur town area is invalid is not tenable."

97. Following the judgments passed by the Hon'ble Apex Court, the Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Bhupendra Pratap Singh Rathore and Ors. Vs Stated of Rajasthan**, reported in **2015 (2) CurCC 303** has held as under :-

"27. Keeping in view the law laid down by the Apex Court, in our considered view, the gazette notification Dt. 05.11.2014 relating to delimitation of Panchayat area; or formation of constituencies in the said area; or allotments of seats to the constituencies is a legislative act in nature and could neither be challenged nor the court can entertain such challenge and in view of the law declared by the Apex Court, prohibiting courts to entertain challenge in view of Art. 243-C, 243-K and 243-O in respect of the above aspects, raised by the petitioners pertaining to constitution / reconstitution/ delimitation of Panchayat areas under the gazette notification Dt. 05.11.2014 cannot be entertained by this court u/Art. 226 of the Constitution and the objection and contentions canvassed by the petitioners in view of Art. 243-C, 243-K read with 243-O coupled with law declared by the Apex Court, is wholly devoid of substance.

28. So far as the objection raised by counsel for petitioner that in the judgment cited by the Apex Court, as there was a clear prohibition of S. 10(2) of the Delimitation Act, the writ petitions are maintainable as the Delimitation Act is not applicable in the facts & circumstances of the instant case. The objections raised is of no substance for the reason that under 73rd amendment to the Constitution, while introducing Part-IX bar to interference by courts in electoral matters u/Art. 243-O(a) and corresponding amendments made in the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 while

functioning for delimitation/alteration of the Panchayati Raj Institutions are regulated in terms of S. 101 of the Act, 1994 and at the same time, there is a bar to interference by courts in the matters relating to delimitation of constituencies and wards u/S. 117 of the Act, 1994 and that being so, the principles laid down by the Apex Court are applicable in the facts & circumstances of the instant case and the gazette notification Dt. 05.11.2014 being a legislative act in nature and keeping in view the bar to interference in the matters relating to the delimitation of the constituencies u/Art. 243- O(a) of the Constitution and so also S. 117 of the Act, 1994, the submission made by the petitioner suffers lack of merit.

29. In our considered view, we find substance in the preliminary objections raised by the respondents which deserve worth acceptance and keeping in view the mandate of Art. 243-O(a) of the Constitution read with S. 117 of the Act, 1994, once a notification of delimitation of constituencies Dt. 05.11.2014 has been published in the official gazette u/S. 101 of the Act, 1994, it has got the force of law and going by the effect of Art. 243-O(a), interference by courts in respect of delimitation of constituencies is barred. Such is the importance of the said notification and the non-obstante clause therein is important and become operative.”

98. Similarly in case of **Mushe Khan vs State of Rajasthan**, reported in **MANU/RH/1342/2014**, this Court has held as under :-

“12. In all the cases before us, as in the writ petitions before the Division Bench at Jaipur, the draft proposals for de-limitation were issued and objections were invited. The period of objections was reduced in view of urgency to complete the election process before 23rd January, 2015. In some of the cases, allegations have been made that the guidelines for minimum and maximum population and the distance for the Proposed headquarter have been violated. In some of the cases, it is stated that the objections were not considered. However, in none of the cases, it is that the objections were not invited or that the objections were not submitted and that no hearing was given.

13. We are in respectful agreement with the reasoning given in the judgment of the Division Bench of this Court at Jaipur in *Bhupendra Pratap Singh Rathore v. State of Rajasthan & Ors.* (supra) and arrive at the same findings that the mandate of Article 243-O(a) of the Constitution of India read with Section 117 of the

Act of 1994, creates a bar on the interference by the Courts in respect of de-limitation of constituencies.


99. In a case while dealing with the contention that opportunity of submitting objection not granted and final notification of Delimitation was issued, the learned Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Kanhaiya Lal Jhanwar vs State of Rajasthan & Ors.** reported in **2016 3 WLC 443** has held as under :-

"13. In the present case, a provisional voters list has been published on 13.06.2015, on which the objections were received and are pending consideration. This writ petition was filed on 23.06.2015, in summer vacations, much after the Notification of delimitation published on 30.04.2015, and the provisional voters list was also published on 13.06.2015. It is admitted that the petitioner had not filed any objections to the delimitation of the wards. The explanation given for not filing the objections, namely that a notice was not published in the newspapers, or by any other means, inviting objections, is, in our opinion, not satisfactory, inasmuch as the Government Order dated 01.01.2015 was published in the leading newspapers, providing for elections of Local Bodies for the year 2015-16, was within the knowledge of the petitioner. He was aware that the wards are proposed to be increased from 30 to 35. Despite being an active politician, he did not choose to either visit, or to find out from the Office of the Collector about the delimitation of the wards and the number of voters. He chose to file the writ petition after the entire period of filing the objections was over, and the delimitation Notification and the provisional voters list was also published.

14. Along with the reply, the State of Rajasthan has also filed the consents given by the Congress party and the BJP, for delimitation, which clearly suggests that sufficient opportunity was given to all concerned including the petitioner, to file the objections. No one raised any objection to the delimitation of wards in Nagar Palika, Nokha, and on which, the State has finalized the Notification.

15. We are of the view that on both the grounds, firstly that the petitioner did not file any objection despite knowledge of the period, within which the delimitation of the increased wards has to be finalized, and further on the Bar created by Article 243ZG of the Constitution of India, no interference should be made in the matter."

100. The law so laid down in the case of **Meghraj Kothari (supra)** as well as **The Tulsipur Sugar Company Limited (supra)**, has been reiterated by the Courts of law time and again



and while dealing with the issues relating to Delimitation notifications and other ancillary issues and consistently held that the interference regarding actions of conditional legislative nature is clearly barred.

101. Per contra, the counsels for the petitioners have argued that this Court retains the power of judicial review even after the issuance of Delimitation notifications, on the strength of judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of

Kishorechandra Chaganlal Vs. Union of India: 2024 INSC

579. The relevant part of the judgment is reproduced below :-

5. We, however, do not approve the view taken by the High Court that the order of delimitation of constituencies, issued in exercise of statutory powers under the Delimitation Act, is entirely insusceptible to the powers of judicial review exercisable under Article 226 of the Constitution. Although Article 329 undeniably restricts the scope of judicial scrutiny re: validity of any law relating to the delimitation of constituencies or the allotment of seats to such constituencies, it cannot be construed to have imposed for every action of delimitation exercise. If judicial intervention is deemed completely barred, citizens would not have any forum to plead their grievances, leaving them solely at the mercy of the Delimitation Commission. As a constitutional court and guardian of public interest, permitting such a scenario would be contrary to the Court's duties and the principle of separation of powers.

6. This understanding is supported by a three-judge bench decision of this Court in Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam v. State of T.N. where the Court was called upon to interpret Articles 243O and 243ZG of the Constitution, which mirror the aforementioned Article 329. Rejecting the contention that these provisions place a complete bar on judicial intervention, it was noted that a constitutional Court can intervene for facilitating the elections or when a case for mala fide or arbitrary exercise of power is made out. Using this, the Court directed delimitation to be conducted for nine new districts. Recently, a three-judge bench of this Court in State of Goa v. Fouziya Imtiaz Shaikh, affirmed the ratio of the above-cited decision while discussing

principles on Article 329(a), and rejected the contention which sought to prove it as per incuriam.

7. Therefore, while the Courts shall always be guided by the settled principles regarding scope, ambit and limitations on the exercise of judicial review in delimitation matters, there is nothing that precludes them to check the validity of orders passed by Delimitation Commission on the touchstone of the Constitution. If the order is found to be manifestly arbitrary and irreconcilable to the constitutional values, the Court can grant the appropriate remedy to rectify the situation.

8. In order to prove that any kind of judicial intervention is fully prohibited, the respondents relied upon a Constitution Bench decision of this Court in *Meghraj Kothari vs. Delimitation Commission and others*. A closer examination of the aforementioned case, however, would show that the Court in that case restricted judicial intervention when the same would unnecessarily delay the election process. This is writ large from the following paragraph, where the Court explicated the reason behind adopting the hands-off approach:

20. In our view, therefore, the objection to the delimitation of constituencies could only be entertained by the Commission before the date specified. Once the orders made by the Commission under Sections 8 and 9 were published in the Gazette of India and in the Official Gazettes of the States concerned, these matters could no longer be reagitated in a court of law. There seems to be very good reason behind such a provision. If the orders made under Sections 8 and 9 were not to be treated as final, the effect would be that any voter, if he so wished, could hold up an election indefinitely by questioning the delimitation of the constituencies from court to court. Section 10(2) of the Act clearly demonstrates the intention of the Legislature that the orders under Sections 8 and 9 published under Section 10(1) were to be treated as law which was not to be questioned in any court.” [emphasis supplied]

9. Hence, the aforementioned judgement does not support the respondents’ contention regarding complete restriction on judicial review. A constitutional court can undertake the exercise of judicial review within the limited sphere at an appropriate stage.

102. In view of the position of law reiterated in various authoritative pronouncements, it is well settled that the final order / notifications for Delimitation are in the nature of



conditional legislation and in view of the Constitutional and statutory Bar the same are not open for interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The Hon'ble Apex Court even in the case of ***Kishorechandra Chaganlal (supra)*** has held that the scope of interference in such cases is of judicial review and only at an appropriate stage. The observations so made by the Hon'ble Apex Court, seen in the light of the Constitutional Bar, it is clear that the interference in such cases can be exercised in the rarest of rare cases where the order is found to be manifestly arbitrary and irreconcilable to the constitutional values.

103. In view of the limited scope of interference as held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Kishorechandra Chaganlal (supra)***, it is desirable to explain the scope of judicial review under Article 226 of the Constitution of India by a High Court. The law in this regard is no more *res integra*. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Tata Cellular v. Union of India, (1994) 6 SCC 651***, has meticulously analyzed the jurisprudential development concerning the doctrine of judicial review and held that the power of judicial review is not unlimited in its sweep but is circumscribed within narrow and well-defined parameters. The Court observed that interference by the judiciary is justified only where the decision under challenge suffers from procedural irregularity or perversity. The relevant para read as follows:

"71. *Judicial quest in administrative matters has been to find the right balance between the administrative discretion to decide matters whether contractual or political in nature or issues of social policy; thus they are not essentially justiciable and the need to remedy any unfairness. Such an unfairness is set right by judicial review.*

72. *Lord Scarman in Nottinghamshire County Council v. Secretary of State for the Environment* [1986 AC 240, 251 : (1986) 1 All ER 199] proclaimed:

'Judicial review' is a great weapon in the hands of the judges; but the judges must observe the constitutional limits set by our parliamentary system upon the exercise of this beneficial power.

Commenting upon this Michael Supperstone and James Goudie in their work Judicial Review (1992 Edn.) at p. 16 say:

If anyone were prompted to dismiss this sage warning as a mere obiter dictum from the most radical member of the higher judiciary of recent times, and therefore to be treated as an idiosyncratic aberration, it has received the endorsement of the Law Lords generally. The words of Lord Scarman were echoed by Lord Bridge of Harwich, speaking on behalf of the Board when reversing an interventionist decision of the New Zealand Court of Appeal in Butcher v. Petrocorp Exploration Ltd. 18-3-1991.

73. *Observance of judicial restraint is currently the mood in England. The judicial power of review is exercised to rein in any unbridled executive functioning. The restraint has two contemporary manifestations. One is the ambit of judicial intervention; the other covers the scope of the court's ability to quash an administrative decision on its merits. These restraints bear the hallmarks of judicial control over administrative action.*

74. Judicial review is concerned with reviewing not the merits of the decision in support of which the application for judicial review is made, but the decision-making process itself.

76. *In R. v. Panel on Take-overs and Mergers, ex p in Guinness plc [(1990) 1 QB 146 : (1989) 1 All ER 509] , Lord Donaldson, M.R. referred to the judicial review jurisdiction as being supervisory or 'longstop' jurisdiction. Unless that restriction on the power of the court is observed, the court will, under the guise of preventing the abuse of power, be itself guilty of usurping power.*

104. Further, in **B.C. Chaturvedi v. Union of India, (1995) 6 SCC 749**, the Apex Court held that the scope of judicial review is restricted to reviewing the legality and propriety of the decision-making process, rather than reassessing the merits or sufficiency of the decision itself. The relevant portion of the judgment is reproduced hereinbelow.

"12. Judicial review is not an appeal from a decision but a review of the manner in which the decision is made. Power of judicial review is meant to ensure that the individual receives fair treatment and not to ensure that the conclusion which the authority reaches is necessarily correct in the eye of the court. When an inquiry is conducted on charges of misconduct by a public servant, the Court/Tribunal is concerned to determine whether the inquiry was held by a competent officer or whether rules of natural justice are complied with. Whether the findings or conclusions are based on some evidence, the authority entrusted with the power to hold inquiry has jurisdiction, power and authority to reach a finding of fact or conclusion. But that finding must be based on some evidence. Neither the technical rules of Evidence Act nor of proof of fact or evidence as defined therein, apply to disciplinary proceeding. When the authority accepts that evidence and conclusion receives support therefrom, the disciplinary authority is entitled to hold that the delinquent officer is guilty of the charge. The Court/Tribunal in its power of judicial review does not act as appellate authority to reappraise the evidence and to arrive at its own independent findings on the evidence. The Court/Tribunal may interfere where the authority held the proceedings against the delinquent officer in a manner inconsistent with the rules of natural justice or in violation of statutory rules prescribing the mode of inquiry or where the conclusion or finding reached by the disciplinary authority is based on no evidence. If the conclusion or finding be such as no reasonable person would have ever reached, the Court/Tribunal may interfere with the conclusion or the finding, and mould the relief so as to make it appropriate to the facts of each case.

105. Recently, the Supreme Court in the case of **SBI v. Ajai Kumar Srivastava, (2021) 2 SCC 612** while reiterating the limited scope of Judicial review has observed that the scope is limited to examining whether the prescribed procedure was duly followed and not to the merits itself. The relevant para reads as follows:

"24. It is thus settled that the power of judicial review, of the constitutional courts, is an evaluation of the decision-making process and not the merits of the decision itself. It is to ensure fairness in treatment and not to ensure fairness of conclusion. The court/tribunal may interfere in the proceedings held against the delinquent if it is, in any manner, inconsistent with the rules of natural justice or in violation of the statutory rules prescribing the mode of enquiry or where the conclusion or finding reached

by the disciplinary authority is based on no evidence. If the conclusion or finding be such as no reasonable person would have ever reached or where the conclusions upon consideration of the evidence reached by the disciplinary authority are perverse or suffer from patent error on the face of record or based on no evidence at all, a writ of certiorari could be issued. To sum up, the scope of judicial review cannot be extended to the examination of correctness or reasonableness of a decision of authority as a matter of fact.

28. *The constitutional court while exercising its jurisdiction of judicial review under Article 226 or Article 136 of the Constitution would not interfere with the findings of fact arrived at in the departmental enquiry proceedings except in a case of mala fides or perversity i.e. where there is no evidence to support a finding or where a finding is such that no man acting reasonably and with objectivity could have arrived at those findings and so long as there is some evidence to support the conclusion arrived at by the departmental authority, the same has to be sustained.*

106. In view of the position of law well settled through various judicial pronouncements, it is clear that in the cases of challenge given to the final notification of delimitation, in the limited scope of judicial review, Constitutional Court can only examine the manifest arbitrariness or infirmities regarding the process of issuing the notifications; however, the merits of the decision cannot be examined or interfered with by this Court.

Analysis of Question No.3:


107. The challenge to the final notifications of delimitation, given in most of the cases is on the ground of non-adherence of the guidelines prescribed with the notices issued under Section 101(1) of the Act of 1994. Counsel for the petitioners argued that Section 101 requires State Government to issue the notification regarding delimitation only after issuing one month's notice "published in the prescribed manner" and under Section 101(6), State Government is empowered to make such orders and give such directions, as it



may consider necessary for that purpose. Reference is also made to Section 98 of the Act of 1994, which provides for delegation of power. Counsels for the petitioners thus argued that guidelines issued by the State Government along with the one month's notice for proposed delimitation are statutory in nature and therefore, strict compliance of the same was required to be done by the State Authorities. Any deviation from the said guidelines renders the further proceedings or even the final notification invalid.

108. Responding to the said arguments, the learned Advocate General argued that Section 101 of the Act of 1994 nowhere provides for issuance of any guideline for the purpose of delimitation. The only mandate of Section 101 is issuance of one month's notice to be published "in prescribed manner" and the instructions contained in the said notice are only guiding principle for the administrative authorities for making proposal for delimitation of area concerned. Mere mentioning of such instructions along with the notice issued under Section 101(1) of the Act of 1994 would not enforce statutory character in the same.

Learned Advocate General contended that the phrase "in prescribed manner" used in Section 101 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 must be read in light of its definition of term "prescribed" under Section 2(xix), which means "prescribed by or under this Act." He further submitted that Powers to make Rules as provided under Section 102 clearly provides that any matter to be prescribed under the Act must be done by way of making rules framed by the State Government and published in the Official Gazette. Learned Advocate General also relied upon the definition of the term 'prescribed' under Section 32(58) of the



Rajasthan General Clauses Act which means *prescribed by rules made under an enactment*. On the strength of said provision, learned Advocate General contended that the so-called guidelines referred by the petitioners were neither issued as rules under Section 102, nor published in the Official Gazette, therefore, the same cannot be said to have statutory force. The Advocate General contended that these guidelines are merely administrative in nature, intended to guide the administrative authorities and cannot be treated as having the binding effect of law.

While responding to the argument of the counsels for the petitioners regarding power of State Government to issue orders under Section 101(6) of the Act of 1994, learned Advocate General stated that there is difference between an order of statutory in nature – having force of law vis-à-vis an order passed in reference to a statutory provision. An administrative order issued in reference to a statutory provision or while exercising to a statutory power will not *ipso facto* make such order of statutory nature. It is thus, contended that since the instructions contained in the notice issued under Section 101 of the Act of 1994 are not enforceable under the law, therefore, no mandamus can be issued merely on the ground of non-adherence of the same.

109. To support the said arguments, learned Advocate General relied upon the judgment passed in the case of ***J.R. Ragupathy vs State of A.P., (1988) 4 SCC 364***. The relevant para is reproduced as under:

17. We find it rather difficult to sustain the interference by the High Court in some of the cases with location of Mandal Headquarters and quashing of the impugned notification on the ground that the Government acted in breach of the guidelines in that one place or the other

was more centrally located or that location at the other place would promote general public convenience or that the Headquarters should be fixed at a particular place with a view to develop the area surrounded by it or that merely because a particular person who was an influential Member of Legislature Assembly belonging to the party in opposition had the right of representation but failed to avail of it. The location of Headquarters by the Government by the issue of the final notification under Sub-section (5) of Section 3 of the Act was on a consideration by the Cabinet Sub Committee of the proposals submitted by the Collectors concerned and the objections and suggestions received from the local authorities like Gram Panchayats and the general public, keeping in view the relevant factors. Even assuming that any breach of the guidelines was justiciable, the utmost that the High Court could have done was to quash the impugned notification in a particular case and direct the Government to reconsider the question. There was no warrant for the High Court to have gone further and directed the shifting of the Mandal Headquarters at a particular place.

18. Broadly speaking, the contention on behalf of the State Government is that relief under Article 226 of the Constitution is not available to enforce administrative rules, regulations or instructions which have no statutory force, in the absence of exceptional circumstances. It is well-settled that mandamus does not lie to enforce departmental manuals or instructions not having any statutory force, which do not give rise to any legal right in favour of the petitioner."

110. Having considered the rival submissions, this Court finds merit in the argument advanced by the learned Advocate General. The term "in prescribed manner" used under Section 101(1) read with Section 2(xix) as well as Section 102 of the Act of 1994 clearly provides that for the purpose of infusing statutory force to any order or guidelines under the Act of 1994, the same must be laid down by way of rules made in accordance with the Act and notified in the Official Gazette. The guidelines relied upon by the petitioners have not undergone such statutory process. They are neither framed under any rule-making power nor published as rules in the Gazette, and hence, they cannot be regarded as possessing statutory character.



Accordingly, the Court holds that the guidelines in question are purely administrative in nature, intended only to facilitate internal procedural compliance, lacking statutory force and thus, not enforceable under the law. Mere non-adherence of the guiding principle cannot be a valid ground to question the final delimitation notification.

Analysis of Question No.4:

111. The present bunch of writ petitions are also opposed by the respondent State on the ground of *locus standi* of the petitioners to maintain the writ petitions. Learned Advocate General submitted that the petitioners have no enforceable right in the matters of delimitation and the process undertaken by the State was well within its legislative competence, guided by the procedure provided under the Statutes which does not create any right in favour of any individual.

112 Learned Advocate General contended that guidelines can be of two kinds. Some guidelines are beneficial in nature, as they confer certain advantages or benefits upon citizens and may thereby create enforceable rights, in respect of which writ petitions can be maintained. However, where the guidelines merely lay down procedural instructions for authorities to follow, without conferring any rights upon individuals, the latter would have no locus standi to file a writ petition alleging non-compliance with such guidelines.. Learned Advocate General placed reliance upon the judgment passed in the case of ***Ayubkhan Noorkhan Pathan vs State of Maharashtra, reported in 2013 (4) SCC 465***. The relevant para is quoted below:

9. *It is a settled legal proposition that a stranger cannot be permitted to meddle in any proceeding, unless he satisfies the Authority/Court, that he falls within the category of aggrieved persons.*

Only a person who has suffered, or suffers from legal injury can challenge the act/action/order etc. in a court of law. A writ petition under [Article 226](#) of the Constitution is maintainable either for the purpose of enforcing a statutory or legal right, or when there is a complaint by the appellant that there has been a breach of statutory duty on the part of the Authorities. Therefore, there must be a judicially enforceable right available for enforcement, on the basis of which writ jurisdiction is resorted to. The Court can of course, enforce the performance of a statutory duty by a public body, using its writ jurisdiction at the behest of a person, provided that such person satisfies the Court that he has a legal right to insist on such performance. The existence of such right is a condition precedent for invoking the writ jurisdiction of the courts. It is implicit in the exercise of such extraordinary jurisdiction that, the relief prayed for must be one to enforce a legal right. In fact, the existence of such right, is the foundation of the exercise of the said jurisdiction by the Court. The legal right that can be enforced must ordinarily be the right of the appellant himself, who complains of infraction of such right and approaches the Court for relief as regards the same.

113 Per contra, learned counsel for the petitioners argued that the respondent State while issuing the said notice under Section 101 of the Act of 1994 has clearly called upon the public at large to make submissions / objections in that regard. It is stated that once in pursuance of a statutory notice, the right to file objection is granted before passing the final notification for any alteration or reconstitution of the Panchayat area, the corresponding right to approach this Court under Article 226 also arises in the event of its violation. Hence, the petitioners do have the locus to maintain the writ petitions.


Reliance is placed upon the judgment in the case of ***Hari Krishna mandir Trust vs. State of Maharashtra 2020 (9) SCC 356.***

"100. The High Courts exercising their jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, not only have the power to issue a Writ of Mandamus or in the nature of Mandamus, but are duty bound to exercise such power, where the Government or a public authority has failed to exercise or has wrongly exercised discretion conferred upon it by a Statute, or a rule, or a policy decision of the Government or has exercised such discretion malafide, or on irrelevant consideration."

114. We have considered the rival submissions and observed that the one-month notice issued by the State Government expressly invites the residents of the concerned village to submit their representations regarding the proposed delimitation. It is a well-established legal principle that, even in matters of delimitation, judicial review is permissible to a limited extent and may be invoked in appropriate cases through writ petitions filed by persons such as the present petitioners. In a democratic framework, citizens cannot be precluded from approaching the constitutional courts in matters concerning the administrative or legislative actions of the Government that impact democratic governance. Both the Hon'ble Supreme Court and this Court have, on multiple occasions, rejected objections regarding locus standi and have entertained writ petitions challenging the delimitation process. Hence, the State's objection concerning the petitioners' locus standi is untenable, and a writ petition challenging delimitation cannot be dismissed solely on that ground.

Analysis of Question No.5:

115. While challenging the process of delimitation, in almost all the cases, counsels for the petitioners have vehemently contended that the authorities concerned have acted in a predetermined and mechanical manner, without adhering to the principles of fair consideration. It has been urged that the objections submitted by



the petitioners/villagers in response to the notice issued under Section 101 of the Act of 1994, were not objectively examined. It is further stated that since the statutory scheme envisages receipt of objections from the villagers to be considered by the concerned District Collector and to forward the same along with his recommendations to the High-Power Committee, therefore, it is obligatory on the part of the State Authorities to grant an opportunity of hearing to the objectors and to decide the objections so submitted in pursuance of the said notice.

Counsels have jointly argued that neither the principle of '*audi alteram partem*' was followed, nor the objections were decided before making recommendations or passing the final notification. As per the counsels for the petitioners, the impugned notifications are liable to be set aside solely on the ground of violation of principles of natural justice and non-consideration of objections.

116. Per contra, learned Advocate General submitted that the petitioners have completely misconstrued the true import of Section 101 of the Act of 1994. It is contended that a close reading of Section 101 clearly shows that the only statutory requirement is issuance of a prior notice of thirty days before effecting any alteration in the boundaries of Panchayati Raj Institutions. The said provision does not provide any specific mandate for inviting the objections, requiring the authorities to adjudicate and decide the same after granting an opportunity of hearing. It is contended that the notice under Section 101 is merely in the nature of an intimation to the public, pursuant to which any person, if so advised, may submit his suggestions. The



statute does not obligate the Government to record its findings and decide each objection individually. In view of the statutory scheme, it will be presumed that the competent authorities will duly consider the suggestions so received in pursuance of the notice, before taking final decision and issuing the requisite notification.

117. Learned Advocate General contended that such legislative intent of Section 101 of the Act of 1994 can also be understood in the light of the fact that for exercising similar powers for delimitation of the Municipality, even the process of issuing one month's notice is not provided under Section 3 of the Act of 2009. Since the process of delimitation is of legislative character, there is no statutory requirement of calling upon the objection, grant of opportunity of hearing and to decide each objection.

118. This Court finds that the objections raised by the petitioners are wholly misconceived and untenable. The statutory framework clearly reflects the legislative intent, and Section 101 of the Act of 1994 does not prescribe any specific requirement for affording an opportunity of hearing or for deciding objections through a reasoned or speaking order. It is a well-established principle that delimitation constitutes a form of conditional legislation; hence, the authorities exercising such powers are neither expected nor required to function as judicial or quasi-judicial bodies. The purpose of inviting public suggestions is merely to enable the State to gather relevant material for forming its subjective satisfaction prior to issuing the final notification of delimitation. In the absence of any statutory mandate requiring the authorities to

invite, adjudicate, or decide objections through a hearing process, this ground of challenge is unsustainable.

119. Our view also finds support from the following observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***The Tulsipur Sugar Co. Ltd vs The Notified Area Committee, Tulsipur, AIR 1980 SC 882.***

9. *In Bates v. Lord Hailsham of St. Marylebone & Ors. the facts were these: In 1964, the British Legal Association was formed. Out of about 26,000 practising solicitors some 2,900 were members of the association. The Lord Chancellor announced on May, 1, 1972, that the scale of fees under Schedule I to the Solicitors' Remuneration Order, 1883 were proposed to be abolished and that for all conveyancing transactions the system of quantum meruit was to be applied. On June 6, pursuant to section 56 (3) of the Solicitors Act 1957, the Law Society was sent by the committee set up under section 56 (1) a draft of the order proposed to be made under section 56 (2). The draft order was published in The Law Society's Gazette on June 21. The association set out two circulars about the proposed order, the first at the end of May, to all solicitors, and the second on July 17, making a series of accusations against the Lord Chancellor and the Law Society. On July 11, the association sent printed submissions to the statutory committee, requesting that the order should not be approved at this juncture and that the Lord Chancellor should seek further consultations with the profession and professional organisations. On July 14, the association wrote to each member of the committee asking for further time and a deferment of the decision for two months. The Lord Chancellor's reply dated July 18, was that he saw no reason for postponing the meeting or for refraining from making the order in such terms as the committee approved. On July 18, the plaintiff as a member of the national executive committee of the association, took out a writ against all members of the statutory committee, seeking a declaration and an injunction, and on July 19, at 2 P.M. having previously notified the Treasury Solicitor of the intention, he moved the court ex parte, seeking to restrain the committee from holding the meeting which was to be held at 4.30 P.M. on that day. The motion was dismissed by Megarry, J. and we feel rightly with the following observations:*

"In the present case, the committee in question has an entirely different function: It is legislative rather than administrative or executive. The function of the committee is to make or refuse to make a legislative instrument under delegated powers. The order, when made, will lay down the remuneration for solicitors generally; and the terms of the order will have to be

considered and construed and applied in numberless cases in the future. Let me accept that in the sphere of the so-called quasi-judicial the rules of natural justice run, and that in the administrative or executive field there is a general duty of fairness. Nevertheless, these considerations do not seem to me to affect the process of legislation, whether primary or delegated. Many of those affected by delegated legislation, and effected very substantially, are never consulted in the process of enacting that legislation, and yet they have no remedy. Of course the informal consultation of representative bodies by the legislative authority is a commonplace, but although a few statutes have specifically provided for a general process of publishing draft delegated legislation and considering objections (see for example, the [Factories Act](#) 1961, Schedule 4), I do not know of any implied right to be consulted or make objections, or any principle upon which the courts may enjoin the legislative process at the suit of those who contend that insufficient time for consultation and consideration has been given. I accept that the fact that the order will take the form of a statutory instrument does not per se make it immune from attack, whether by injunction or otherwise; but what is important is not its form but its nature, which is plainly legislative".

10. We are, therefore, of the view that the maxim 'audi alteram partem' does not become applicable to the case by necessary implication.

120. Similarly, the Division Bench of this Court in ***D. B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20142/2024 Motan Das & Ors. Vs. State & Ors.*** **decided on 28.02.2025**, while framing specific question in this regard has held as under:

"18. Further, with regard to the submission made on behalf of the petitioners regarding the failure to fulfil the principles of natural justice, specially the maxim of Audi Alteram Partem, this Court is conscious of the ratio laid down in the case of Ashok Khetoliya (supra), relevant paras of which are reproduced as follows:

"11. This Court in Tulsipur Sugar Co. Ltd. held as under:

"7. We are concerned in the present case with the power of the State Government to make a declaration constituting a geographical area into a town area under Section 3 of the Act which does not require the State Government to make such declaration after giving notice of its intention so to do to the members of the public and inviting their representations regarding such action. The power of the State Government to make a declaration under Section 3 of the Act is legislative in character because the application of the rest of the

provisions of the Act to the geographical area which is declared as a town area is dependent upon such declaration. Section 3 of the Act is in the nature of a conditional legislation. Dealing with the nature of functions of a non-judicial authority, Prof. S.A. De Smith in Judicial Review of Administrative Action (3rd Edn.) observes at p. 163:

"However, the analytical classification of a function may be a conclusive factor in excluding the operation of the audi alteram partem rule. It is generally assumed that in English law the making of a subordinate legislative instrument need not be preceded by notice or hearing unless the parent Act so provides."

9. We are, therefore, of the view that the maxim "audi alteram partem" does not become applicable to the case by necessary implication."

19. This Court in light of the aforementioned, observes that in the instant case the maxim "audi alteram partem" in absence of any express provision, is not applicable merely by necessary implication and therefore, the impugned notifications do not suffer from any illegality on that count as well. Thus, the Issue (ii), as aforesaid, stands answered accordingly.

Analysis of Question No.6:

121. We have examined all the writ petitions challenging the final delimitation notifications issued under Section 101 of the Act of 1994 or Section 3 of the Act of 2009, pertaining to the exclusion or inclusion of Panchayat or Municipal areas, respectively. Although the petitions present varying combinations of grounds, but there exists a substantial commonality of the issues raised across them. In this part of the judgment, the remaining factual and legal grounds assailing the final delimitation notifications shall be considered and adjudicated upon.

Almost all the writ petitions raise the issue of non-compliance with the guidelines, instructions, or parameters prescribed in the delimitation notice. The submissions made by the respective counsels, both during oral arguments and in their written submissions, clearly indicate that the challenges to the



final notifications are based on common grounds — such as non-adherence to distance or population criteria, inappropriate inclusion or exclusion of certain areas, failure to decide objections, denial of opportunity of hearing, and instances where Panchayat areas previously included within a Municipality have again been brought under Panchayat jurisdiction.

It was further submitted that there exists no administrative necessity for undertaking the current delimitation exercise and that the same has been initiated arbitrarily, without adherence to the guiding principles laid down by the State itself.

In addition to these, the petitioners have also alleged arbitrary and mala fide exercise of power, political motivation behind the decisions, non-application of mind, and that the recommendations were made without due consideration of the objections or suggestions received.

Besides the challenge to the final delimitation notification itself, several petitions also question the consequential actions arising therefrom, such as, cessation of tenure of members of the affected wards, removal of a *Pradhan* due to exclusion of his ward from the Panchayat area, appointment of outgoing *Sarpanch* as Administrator, and failure to appoint the Member or Chairperson of the Municipality as Administrator. These consequential or ancillary issues, other than the main challenge to the final delimitation notification, shall be addressed in the subsequent part of this judgment.

122. While replying to the grounds of challenge on its merits, learned Advocate General reiterated that in view of the



preliminary objections, the adjudication upon the merits of writ petitions is not desirable. Learned Advocate General further stated that most of the grounds of challenge such as, distance / population criteria not being followed and the location of a particular area is not suitable for proposed exclusion / inclusion etc. are raised while referring to the guidelines, which are only in the nature of administrative instructions and since the same does not have any enforceability under the law, the challenge upon the said grounds is not sustainable.

Learned Advocate General further submitted that bald allegations of political interference or arbitrary exercise of powers are levelled and the same are bereft of any substance. Further, the same involves various disputed questions of facts, which cannot be decided under the writ jurisdiction. It is further contended that the petitioners have failed to make out any ground, warranting interference of this Court within the limited scope of judicial review.

123. As already concluded, the guidelines issued along with the delimitation notice do not possess any statutory force and, therefore, are not legally enforceable. Any alleged deviation from such guidelines, by itself, without making out a deserving case for interference under limited scope of judicial review, cannot constitute a sufficient ground for this Court to interfere with the final delimitation decision. The petitioners have failed to demonstrate any procedural irregularity or violation of a statutory provision in the process adopted by the State Government while issuing the final notifications. Nor have they established that the



authorities acted beyond their jurisdiction in exercising their powers relating to delimitation.

It has been consistently held by the courts of law that decisions regarding delimitation fall within the domain of the State's subjective satisfaction and are generally beyond judicial scrutiny as to their merits. Under the constitutional and statutory framework, delimitation decisions are required to be taken while holistically considering multiple factors—such as population, distance, financial viability for effective administration, future growth prospects, and other relevant considerations. Hence, such decisions must be assessed holistically, and the non-consideration of any single factor cannot, by itself, justify judicial interference with the final outcome.

Moreover, there have been counter-submissions concerning the allegations related to distance and population criteria, which give rise to several disputed questions of fact. The legal position in this regard is well settled that while exercising jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, this Court cannot enter into or adjudicate upon such factual controversies.

Accordingly, while this Court notes the petitioners' concerns regarding deviation from the parameters mentioned in the guidelines, however such deviations do not constitute a legal infirmity capable of rendering the process invalid.

In the present cases, the petitioners have not been able to establish any procedural irregularity, legal infirmity, or manifest arbitrariness that would offend constitutional principles. Accordingly, the limited scope of judicial review does not warrant



any interference by this Court. The challenges raised by the petitioners on grounds relating to distance, population, or locational criteria are, therefore, unsustainable in law.

124. The petitioners have assailed the delimitation notification on the grounds of arbitrary exercise of power and non-application of mind. However, we find no merit in these contentions. The material on record clearly demonstrates that cogent reasons were recorded for undertaking the delimitation exercise, particularly in light of the fact that the outgoing Government had created 17 new districts in the State of Rajasthan. Subsequently, in 2024, upon re-evaluating that decision and for ensuring better administrative efficiency, 9 out of the said 17 districts were abolished and merged with the existing ones.

The creation and abolition of districts not only altered the boundaries of Legislative Assembly constituencies but also impacted the territorial limits of local self-government institutions. Taking note of these changes, a three-member Cabinet Committee was constituted, and thereafter, a well-considered policy decision was taken to initiate a fresh delimitation exercise. In these circumstances, the allegation of non-application of mind is devoid of substance and unsustainable in law.

Moreover, it is a settled legal position that judicial interference in matters involving such policy decisions is extremely limited. Since no element of arbitrariness has been established, this ground too must fail.

125. The petitioners' have also made unsubstantiated allegations suggesting that the notifications were politically motivated. Apart



from vague assertions, no specific instance of mala fides has been pleaded or established in the writ petitions. The argument that the final notifications resemble the recommendations of certain local representatives also holds no weight. Given that the process of delimitation possesses an inherent legislative character, the mere fact that public representatives offered suggestions or recommendations, does not *ipso-facto* render the decision invalid.

126. The observations made above finds support from the judgement passed by this Court in the case of ***Mod Singh and Anr. Vs. State of Rajasthan & Anr.*** reported in ***1994 Supreme (Raj) 1014***, wherein this Court has dealt with various similar issues, such as, nature of delimitation exercise, statutory procedural requirements, applicability of principle of natural justice, scope of interference by the Court etc, and held as under :

"23. A careful perusal of these rules indicates that whenever the State Government proposes to take action u/S. 86 of the Act on its own motion, the Collector will be required to examine the proposals for including, excluding or transferring any such area and to send his report to the officer-in-charge of panchayats i.e. the Director, Gramin Vikas and Panchayati Raj. On receiving the report proposal of the Collector w/R. 342, the officer-in-charge of Panchayats is required to consider the same and send his recommendation in the matter to the State Government or such officer or authority to whom the powers of the State Government may have been delegated. If after considering the report of the Collector and the recommendation of the officer-in-charge of the panchayats, the State Government or its Delegatee proposes to include any area in a panchayat circle, exclude any area from the panchayat circle or transfer any area from one panchayat circle to another, it is required to issue a notice u/S. 86 (1) of the Act inviting objections to the proposed transfer, which term also includes the constitution, reconstitution and re-delimitation of a panchayat circle, of any area from one Panchayat Circle to another, inclusion of any area in a panchayat circle or exclusion of an area from a panchayat Circle. The objections are to be filed within a month from the date of the publication of such notice. Copy of such notice

issued u/S. 86 (1) of the Act is required to be pasted at a conspicuous place in each of the areas affected thereby and at the office of each Panchayats concerned and the panchayat Samiti concerned. After objections are filed in pursuance of the notice u/S. 86(1) of the Act, the State Government or its Delegatee is required to examine and consider the objections and authorised either to drop the proposal or confirm or vary the same. Therefore, it is crystal clear that the State Government or its Delegatee is not duty bound to accept either the proposal of the Collector or the recommendation of officer-in-charge of Panchayats or the draft proposal issued u/S. 86 (1) of the Act in to to even if no objection is filed. On the other hand, after considering the objections, if any, the State Government or its Delegatee is legally empowered either to drop the proposal notified u/S. 86 (1) or to confirm or vary the same. If the proposal notified u/S. 86 (1) is not dropped then the State Government shall issue a final notification, which should be published in the official gazette and such publication shall be conclusive evidence of such transfer, inclusion or exclusion of area, unless the same is subsequently cancelled or superseded. Therefore, if the final notification u/S. 86 (2) is subsequently cancelled or superseded only then the exercise u/s. 86 (1) of the Act r/w Rr. 342 to 345 of the Rules, 1961 has to be undertaken de novo and not otherwise. Therefore, I do not find any substance of force in the contention of learned counsel for the petitioners that since the petitioners/villagers were satisfied, with the draft proposal included in the draft notification issued u/S. 86(1) of the Act, they did not choose to file any objection and that thereafter the State Government or its Delegatee had no right to drop or vary the draft: proposal without affording them any opportunity of hearing anti without again issuing notification u/S. 86 (1) of the Act inviting objections for such a change.

24. Now let us find out whether the establishment of a panchayat circle or merging a panchayat circle into another panchayat circle or inclusion of any area in a panchayat circle or exclusion of any area from a panchayat circle of transfer, which includes the constitution, re-constitution or re-delimitation of a panchayat circle, of any area from one panchayat circle to another, is a mere administrative act of the State or is a function of legislative character and whether for such an exercise, principles of natural justice apply?

25. The State Government under Sections 3 and 86 of the Act is competent and empowered to establish, constitute, reconstitute and delimit any panchayat circle and to include any area in a panchayat circle, exclude or transfer any area in a panchayat circle or from one panchayat circle to another after following the prescribed procedure.

26. In the *Tulsipur Sugar Co. Ltd v. The Notified Arca Committee, Tulsipur* (AIR 1980 SC 882). the

notification dated 22-5-1955 was challenged, whereby the area in which the sugar factory was situated, was declared as town area. Section 3 of the U. P. Town Area Act, 1914 made the provisions for declaration and definition of town areas. It was contended that Section 3 of the said Act by necessary implication imposed a duty on the State Government to follow the principles of natural justice. Their Lordships observed that the said contention was based on assumption that the duty imposed on the State Government was of the nature of administrative power in exercise of which the State Government should follow the principles of natural justice. Their Lordships then proceeded to examine the question as to what was the nature of function which was performed by the State Government u/S. 3, and declared in most unambiguous, clear and cogent terms that the power of the State Government to make a declaration to define a town area u/S. 3 of the said Act was in the nature of conditional legislation and that the rule of 'audi alteram partem' did not apply.

27. The Division Bench of this Court in *Ms. J. K. Synthetics Ltd. v. Municipal Board, Nimbahera* 1989 (2) RLR 589, relying on the principle of law enunciated in *Indian Express Newspaper (Bombay) Pvt. Ltd. v. Union of India*, AIR 1986 SC 515 and *Sundarjas Kanyalal Bhathija v. Collector, Thane, Maharashtra* AIR 1990 SC 261 has held that the inclusion of a new area within a municipal area by the State Government is legislative in character and that in such a legislative process, principles of natural justice are not applicable. There is no provision of law or any case law to the effect that establishment, reconstitution, delimitation of a panchayat Circle, where the area included excluded or transferred is only an area of panchayat and not an area of Municipality, shall not be a function of the State legislative in character. In my considered opinion the exercise undertaken u/S. 3 and 86 of the Act r/w. Rules 342 to 345 of the Rules, 1961 amounts to a delegated legislation and principle of audi alteram partem cannot be pressed into service except to the extent provided under those provisions. Therefore, the petitioners cannot claim as a matter of right for an opportunity of hearing for all the final decisions taken by the State Government or State Delegatee in dropping the draft proposal issued u/S. 86(1) of the Act or in varying or altering the same....

39. Therefore, when the State Government has not contravened any provisions of Rr. 342 to 345 of the Rules, 1961 and Sections 3. 86 and 87(2) of the Act, this Court cannot sit in appeal against the final decisions taken by the State Government/State Delegatees nor can it substitute its own finding as to whether which of the village area should be included in a particular panchayat circle or in which village the headquarter of a particular panchayat circle should be located or whether a particular panchayat circle, should be bifurcated into more than one panchayat circles or whether one panchayat circle should not be

merged or converted into another panchayat circle and whether the name of a particular panchayat circle should be changed or not.

40. From the perusal of the relevant record, I am of the considered opinion that the act of the respondents in issuing the impugned notifications has neither been unreasonable nor arbitrary nor discriminatory and those are not violative of Article 14.

41. After the repeal of the Act and coming into force of the Panchayati Raj Act, 1994, all the Panchayat circles established, constituted, reconstituted and re-delimited through impugned notification have become successor Panchayat Circles under the new Act. In exercise of the powers u/s. 119 and Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994, the Election Commission has already been constituted and Panchayati Raj Rules, 1994 have also been enacted. The new wards and different panchayat circles have also been constituted and notified and the election of the Panchayat Raj are on the anvil, which are likely to be held in near future.

42. Hence for the reasons mentioned above, the impugned notifications dated 10-9-92 do not warrant any interference. The aforementioned writ petitions, therefore, deserve to be and are hereby dismissed. No order as to costs. Petitions dismissed."

127. It is also pertinent to note that the delimitation exercise was undertaken uniformly across the State, rather than in a selective or targeted manner. Hence, the claim of political motivation is without basis. Considering the totality of circumstances, none of the grounds raised in the writ petitions fall within the narrow ambit of judicial review permissible before this Court. Accordingly, the challenge given to the final delimitation notifications on such grounds is not sustainable in light of the conclusions recorded herein.

128. Counsel for the petitioners while challenging the notifications issued under Section 3 of the Act of 2009, where the rural area has been excluded from the Panchayat Circle and included in the Municipal area, has contended that the said action is against the spirit of the Article 243 of the Constitution of India. It is argued



that Eleventh Schedule of the Constitution of India provides for functions of the Panchayat and Twelfth Schedule provides for functions of the Municipality. As per counsel for the petitioners, comparison of the same shows that factors provided in Eleventh Schedule are much wider than the functions of the Municipality as prescribed under Twelfth Schedule of the Constitution of India and by excluding the Gram Panchayat from the scope of the rural development and including the same in the Municipality, very spirit of Article 243 of the rural development would be curtailed.

129. Replying to the said contention, learned Advocate General has argued that same is absolutely misconceived. It is contended that if the said contention of the petitioners is accepted then, the Panchayat area would always remain as rural area and can, in no case, be upgraded to the urban area. It is further argued that inclusion of a rural area within an urban area is inherently an act aimed at promoting development; therefore, it cannot be concluded that such inclusion restricts or hinders rural development.

130. The argument so advanced on behalf of the petitioners is bereft of any substance and against the overall scheme of local self-governance as provided under the Constitution of India. Article 243Q of the Constitution of India, which provides for constitution of the Municipality, which also includes transition from rural area to urban area. The statutory provisions provided under the Act of 1994 as well as Act of 2009 also provide for exclusion of Panchayat area for its corresponding inclusion in the Municipal area. The validity / vires of the said provisions and the power to



merge the rural area into municipal area are not challenged by the petitioners and in absence thereof, mere a challenge given to the notifications on such ground while exercising the said powers, is not tenable in the eye of law.

131. Counsel for the petitioner, while referring to Article 243Q of the Constitution of India, has argued that the action of respondents in issuing the notification and directly including rural area in the urban area, without first declaring the same as transitional area, is against the mandate of Article 243Q. It is contended that Article 243Q provides for “transitional area’ which is a stage prior to the inclusion of rural area into Municipal area and therefore, notifications issued directly to include a rural area into municipal area is against the Constitutional mandate.

132. A holistic reading of Article 243Q of the Constitution of India makes it evident that clause (1) delineates three distinct and independent categories of Municipalities, and there is no constitutional mandate requiring the declaration or formation of a transitional area as a prerequisite for incorporating a rural area into an urban area. In other words, under the constitutional framework, the declaration of a “transitional area” is not a mandatory condition precedent for including a rural area within an urban area.

The intent of the framers of the Constitution is clearly reflected in clause (2) of Article 243Q, wherein the use of the term “*may*” indicates that the Governor, at his discretion and upon consideration of relevant factors, *may* constitute any area as a Municipality. Furthermore, neither the provisions of the Act of



2009 nor those of the Act of 1994 prescribe that a rural area must first be declared a transitional area or Nagar Panchayat before being included within an urban area.

133. Our view also get support from the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of "**State of Rajasthan vs. Ashok Khetoliya**" reported in **2022 (12) SCC 185**, wherein it was observed in Para Nos. 16, 17 & 19 as under :-

"16. Since the local Government falls in Entry 5 of List II of the Seventh Schedule, therefore, it is the State Legislature alone which is competent to legislate in respect of the Municipalities with only one limitation that the provisions of the State Act cannot be inconsistent with the mandate of the scheme of Part IX-A of the Constitution. The scheme of Part IX-A of the Municipalities Act does not contemplate a separate notification under Article 243-Q of the Constitution and thereafter under Section 5 of the Municipalities Act. As Section 5 of the Municipalities Act is not inconsistent with any provisions of Article 243-Q of the Constitution, therefore, two notifications are not contemplated or warranted under the scheme of Part IX-A or the Municipalities Act as reproduced in the table above.

17. The State Government is competent to divide the Municipalities in the State into classes according to their income or other factors like population or importance of the local area and other circumstances as provided under Section 329 of the Municipalities Act. In terms of Section 329, a Notification was issued on 30-4-2012 determining the category of the Municipal Corporation/Municipal Council/Municipal Board. The said notification reads as under

19. The above notifications would show that the State Government had exercised powers to establish Municipality in terms of Section 5 of the Municipalities Act. Such notifications cannot be said to be illegal or arbitrary in any manner and were rightly issued in exercise of the statutory powers conferred on the State by the legislature."

134. Similar view has been taken by the learned Division Bench of this Court in the case of **D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.8177/2025 (Pankaj Panwar vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.) decided on 06.05.2025**, wherein it is held as under :-

"9. Clause 2 to Article 243Q of the Constitution of India provides that the Governor of the State shall decide what shall constitute a transitional area or a smaller urban area or a larger urban area. It is also provided under Clause 2 that while taking a decision with respect to any such area the Governor shall have due regard to (i) population of the area, (ii) density of the population, (iii) revenue generated for local administration, (iv) percentage of employment in non-agricultural activities, (v) economic importance or (vi) such other factors as he may deem fit. Quite clearly, it is not only the population of the area which shall be the determinative factor rather there shall be host of other factors that the Governor shall take into consideration before making a declaration under Clause 2 to Article 243Q of the Constitution of India. We would also refer to section 3 of the Rajasthan Municipalities Act, 2009 which provides that the State Government may, by notification published in the Official Gazette, declare any local area not included within the limits of a Municipality to be a Municipality, or include any such area in a Municipality, or exclude any local area from a Municipality, or otherwise alter the limits of any Municipality. It is provided that the provisions under the Rajasthan Municipalities Act shall have over-riding effect notwithstanding any provision contained thereunder or in the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 or any other law for the time being in force. We may also refer to section 101 which provides that the State Government may at any time after one month's notice published in the prescribed manner either on its own motion or at the request made in this behalf and by a notification published in the Official Gazette (a) declare the whole or a part of any local area included within the limits of a Municipality to be a panchayat circle or (b) include in a panchayat circle and such local area or a part thereof, or as the case may be, any local area included within the limits of another panchayat circle or (c) otherwise alter the limits of a panchayat circle by amalgamating one panchayat circle into another or by splitting up a panchayat circle into two or more panchayat circles. In "Parmar Samantsinh Umedsinh v. State of Gujarat & Ors." (2022) 15 SCC 364, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that the power of the State Legislature in the light of enabling provisions in the Constitution with regard to framing of laws cannot be whittled down by way of restrictive interpretation. The Supreme Court further observed that the power of the State to legislate within its legislative competence is plenary and the same cannot be curtailed

in the absence of an express limitation placed on such power in the Constitution."

135. The import of the aforementioned judgment is clear: under the statutory framework, the State Government possesses plenary powers to issue notifications for the inclusion or exclusion of any area within a Panchayat or Municipality. The State is the repository of these legislative powers, and once the State Government, in the exercise of such powers and after considering the factors specified in Article 243Q of the Constitution, issues a notification, it is not open for interference by this Court. Consequently, this ground of challenge, being inconsistent with the constitutional and statutory scheme, fails.

136. Counsel for the petitioners also argued that the impugned notifications are not sustainable as no prior consultation of the State Election Commission was done before issuing the same. Counsel for the petitioners contended that as per Articles 243K and 243ZA of the Constitution of India, the superintendence, directions and control of the respective Panchayat and Municipal elections is vested in the State Election Commission and therefore, in the matters of delimitation, prior consultation with the State Election Commission is mandatory.

137. A bare reading of the Article 243K & 243ZA provides that superintendence, direction and control of the State Election Commission is provided in preparation of electoral rolls and conduct of elections of the Panchayat / Municipality. The process of delimitation constitutes a distinct legislative function and Article 243ZA of the Constitution of India does not expressly assign any role to the State Election Commission in that regard. Therefore, in



the absence of any specific provision conferring such a role, it cannot be contended that prior consultation with the State Election Commission is mandatory and non-adherence of the same would vitiate the notifications impugned. Therefore, challenge given to the notifications on the wholly baseless and misconceived.

138. In some of the cases the notifications issued under Section 3 of the Act of 2009, for inclusion of some rural area into Municipality has been challenged on the ground that the said inclusion has been done merely while exercising powers under Section 3 of the Act of 2009, without undertaking the procedure as prescribed under Section 101 of the Act of 1994 and no corresponding notification under Section 101 is issued for excluding the Panchayat area. The counsel argued that in view of over-riding effect of provisions of Act of 1994, before taking any action for inclusion / exclusion of panchayat area the procedure prescribed under section 101 is mandatory to be followed. It is further stated that non-adherence of procedure as prescribed under section 101 has deprived the petitioner from there participative rights.

139. The contention so raised by the petitioners was vehemently opposed objected by the learned Advocate General. It is though admitted that Section 101 of the Act of 1994 provides for the powers and procedure for alteration in the limits of Panchayati Raj Institution and Section 101(7) of the Act of 1994 provides overriding effect to the provisions of the Act of 1994 over all other statutes.



However, in cases where under Section 3 of the Act of 2009, a rural area is proposed to be included for constitution of Municipality, the Section 101 of the Act of 1994 will not be applicable and the same can be done only by issuance of notification under Section 3 of the Act of 2009. It is contended that Section (10) of Section 3 of the Act of 2009 clearly provides that **"the provisions of Section 3 shall have effect notwithstanding anything contained in the Act of 2009 or in Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 or any other law for the time being in force."** Learned Advocate General submitted that the Municipality Act, 2009 being a subsequent legislation, the overriding effect as provided under section 39(10) would prevail over the overriding effect as provided under the Act of 1994.

140. In support of said contention, learned Advocate General relied upon a recent judgment passed by a coordinate Bench of this Court at Principal Seat, Jodhpur in the case of "**Motan Das vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.**" (**D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20142/2024**) and other connected writ petitions decided on **28.02.2025**. The relevant paras of the said judgment are quoted below :-

"16. This Court further observes that the legality of the impugned notifications and the scope of non-interference in the instant case, depends upon the compliance with provisions of the Act of 1994 and the Act of 2009.

16.1. The relevant provisions in the present case are Section 3 of the Act of 2009 and Section 101 of the Act of 1994, which are reproduced as hereunder:

"3. Delimitation of Municipalities. - (1) The State Government may, by notification published in the Official Gazette, declare any local area not included within the limits of a Municipality to be a Municipality, or include any such area in a Municipality, or exclude any local area from a Municipality, or otherwise alter the limits of any Municipality and when (a) any local area is

declared as, or included in, a Municipality, or (b) any local area is excluded from a Municipality, or (c) the limits of a Municipality are otherwise altered, by amalgamation of one Municipality into another or by splitting up a Municipality into two or more Municipalities...

(10) Save as otherwise provided in this Section its provisions shall have effect notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (Act No.13 of 1994) or any other law for the time being in force."

"101. Alteration in the limits of a Panchayati Raj Institution.- (1) The State Government may, at any time, after one month's notice published in the prescribed manner either on its own motion or at the request made in this behalf, and by notification in the Official Gazette- (a) declare the whole or apart of any local area included within the limits of a Municipality to be a Panchayat Circle; or (b) include in a Panchayat Circle and such local area or a part thereof, or as the case may be, any local area included within the limits of another Panchayat Circle; or (c) otherwise alter the limits of a Panchayat Circle by amalgamating one Panchayat Circle into another or by splitting up a Panchayat Circle into two or more Panchayat Circles; ...

(7) Save as otherwise provided in this section its provisions shall have effect, notwithstanding anything contained in this Act or the Rajasthan Municipalities Act, 1959 (Rajasthan Act 38 of 1959) or any other law for the time being in force."

17. This Court observes that, the bone of the contention in the instant case, lies in the applicability of the Act of 1994 and the Act of 2009. The relevant provisions in the present case are Section 3 of the Act of 2009 and Section 101 of the Act of 1994. Section 3 does not expressly provide for any requirement vis-a-vis notice, however, Section 101 presents the requirement of one month's notice.

17.1. This Court further observes that both these provisions which expound different requisites contain non obstante clauses respectively, which ousts the applicability of the other Statute and corresponding relevant provisions within it. Therefore, for resolving the controversy at hand, it becomes pertinent to first answer the question as to which out of the two provisions will prevail if both of them have a non obstante clause.

17.2. This Court in this regard, observes that as per the judgment rendered in the case of Kotak Mahindra Bank Limited (supra), the position of law is that, when two enactments have competing non obstante provisions and nothing repugnant, then the non obstante clause of the subsequent statute would prevail over the earlier enactments and therefore the non obstante clause in the

Act of 2009 would prevail over the non obstante clause in the Act of 1994.

17.3. This Court therefore observes that, in such a scenario Section 3 of the Act of 2009 would prevail over Section 101 of the Act of 1994, and in such a case, the requirement of one month notice as enshrined under Section 101 is not necessary to be complied with."

141. In our considered opinion the issue raised by the petitioners regarding non-compliance of Section 101 of the Act of 1994 is completely answered in the judgment passed in the case of **Motan Das** (*supra*) and therefore, the said the ground of challenge to the final notifications in questions is also not tenable in the eye of law.

142. In some of the writ petitions, challenge has been given to the notifications issued for inclusion or exclusion of areas through delimitation, falling within the **TSP area**. Counsel for the petitioners stated that the Tribal Sub-Plan area is an area of special significance in the Constitution of India and the same is governed under Fifth Schedule of the Constitution of India. Counsel for the petitioners have also referred to the provisions of the Panchayat (Extension of Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996 (hereinafter referred to as "PESA Act") and stated that the said Act clearly mandates the participation and consultation with the Gram Sabha in every decision relating to the TSP area.

Counsel for the petitioners stated that while issuing the final notifications of delimitation, no consultation has been done with the Gram Sabha and therefore, delimitation notifications regarding such areas are against the mandate of Fifth Schedule as well as provisions of the PESA Act.



143. Counsel for the petitioners relied upon the judgment passed by a coordinate Bench of this Court at Jodhpur in the case of **"Bhanwar Lal Mundra & Ors. V/s The State of Rajasthan & ors." (D. B. Civil Writ Petition No.10491/2009) decided on 13.05.2015.**

144. Replying to the said contention, learned Advocate General has stated that neither the constitutional provisions pertaining to the scheduled area nor the provisions of the PESA Act anywhere provide for participation of the Gram Sabha in the matters of delimitation, which are having the legislative character. Learned Advocate General has referred to Section 4 of the PESA Act, which reads as under :-

"4. Exceptions and modifications to Part IX of the Constitution.— Notwithstanding anything contained under Part IX of the Constitution, the Legislature of a State shall not make any law under that Part which is inconsistent with any of the following features, namely:—

(a) a State legislation on the Panchayats that may be made shall be in consonance with the customary law, social and religious practices and traditional management practices of community resources;

(b) a village shall ordinarily consist of a habitation or a group of habitations or a hamlet or a group of hamlets comprising a community and managing its affairs in accordance with traditions and customs;

(c) every village shall have a Gram Sabha consisting of persons whose names are included in the electoral rolls for the Panchayat at the village level;

(d) every Gram Sabha shall be competent to safeguard and preserve the traditions and customs of the people, their cultural identity, community resources and the customary mode of dispute resolution;

(e) every Gram Sabha shall—

(i) approve the plans, programmes and projects for social and economic development before such plans, programmes and projects are taken up for implementation by the Panchayat at the village level;

(ii) be responsible for the identification or selection of persons as beneficiaries under the poverty alleviation and other programmes;

(f) every Panchayat at the village level shall be required to obtain from the Gram Sabha a certification of utilisation of funds by that Panchayat for the plans, programmes and projects referred to in clause(e);

(g) the reservation of seats in the Scheduled Areas at every Panchayat shall be in proportion to the population of the communities in that Panchayat for whom reservation is sought to be given under Part IX of the Constitution:

Provided that the reservation for the Scheduled Tribes shall not be less than one-half of the total number of seats:

Provided further that all seats of Chairpersons of Panchayats at all levels shall be reserved for the Scheduled Tribes;

(h) the State Government may nominate persons belonging to such Scheduled Tribes as have no representation in the Panchayat at the intermediate level or the Panchayat at the district level:

Provided that such nomination shall not exceed one-tenth of the total members to be elected in that Panchayat;

(i) the Gram Sabha or the Panchayats at the appropriate level shall be consulted before making the acquisition of land in the Scheduled Areas for development projects and before re-settling or rehabilitating persons affected by such projects in the Scheduled Areas; the actual planning and implementation of the projects in the Scheduled Areas shall be coordinated at the State level;

(j) planning and management of minor water bodies in the Scheduled Areas shall be entrusted to Panchayats at the appropriate level;

(k) the recommendations of the Gram Sabha or the Panchayats at the appropriate level shall be made mandatory prior to grant of prospecting licence or mining lease for minor minerals in the Scheduled Areas;

(l) the prior recommendation of the Gram Sabha or the Panchayats at the appropriate level shall be made mandatory for grant of concession for the exploitation of minor minerals by auction;

(m) while endowing Panchayats in the Scheduled Areas with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as institutions of self-government, a State Legislature shall ensure that the Panchayats at the appropriate level and the Gram Sabha are endowed specifically with—

(i) the power to enforce prohibition or to regulate or restrict the sale and consumption of any intoxicant;

(ii) the ownership of minor forest produce;

(iii) the power to prevent alienation of land in the Scheduled Areas and to take appropriate action to restore any unlawfully alienated land of a Scheduled Tribe;

(iv) the power to manage village markets by whatever name called;

(v) the power to exercise control over money lending to the Scheduled Tribes;

(vi) the power to exercise control over institutions and functionaries in all social sectors;

(vii) the power to control over local plans and resources for such plans including tribal sub-plans;

(n) the State legislations that may endow Panchayats with powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as institutions of self-government shall contain safeguards to ensure that Panchayats at the higher level do not assume the powers and authority of any Panchayat at the lower level or of the Gram Sabha;

(o) the State Legislature shall endeavour to follow the pattern of the Sixth Schedule to the Constitution while designing the administrative arrangements in the Panchayats at district levels in the Scheduled Areas."

145. After analysing the said contention and giving thoughtful consideration to the provisions of the PESA Act, it is clear that the participation of the Gram Sabha is mandated only for the functions as prescribed under Section 4 of the PESA Act, which deals with the resettlement, rehabilitation or development of the TSP area. In absence of any specific statutory requirement prescribed under the Constitution of India or the PESA Act, it cannot be held that the prior consultation of the Gram Sabha for the purpose of delimitation, TSP Area is mandatory. The judgments relied upon by the petitioners in **Bhanwar Lal Mundra** (supra) and other judgments are not related to the issue so raised, therefore, the same are not applicable in the facts of the present case. Hence,



the challenge given by the petitioners to the delimitation notifications on such grounds fails.

146. In some of the writ petitions, the petitioners have challenged the final notifications on the ground that on earlier occasion, some part of the Panchayat area has been included, whereas, while issuing the notifications impugned, the said notifications were withdrawn or the rural area is again excluded from the Municipality. Counsels for the petitioners contended that said exercise clearly shows arbitrary exercise of the powers by the State authorities and the same cannot be allowed to be sustained.

147. Learned Advocate General while responding to the said challenge, has reiterated the submission regarding scope of interference of this Court in such matters. It is contended that once the State Government after thoughtful consideration of, overall factors has taken a conscious decision, the same cannot be interfered with by this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Reliance has been placed upon a recent judgment passed by the learned Division Bench of this Court in the case of **Pankaj Panwar** (*supra*). The relevant part of the judgment is quoted below :

"3. According to the petitioners, the Sub-divisional Officer at Raniwada started the process for creating 20 wards in the erstwhile Gram Panchayat Raniwada and for that purpose a notice inviting objection was published on 27th March 2025. The petitioners have produced on record the copies of notifications pertaining to Gram Panchayats Jhakhal and Dundlod both dated 02nd September 2024 to demonstrate that similar exercises were undertaken in other Gram Panchayats. However, the said process was abruptly halted because the Government Notification dated 26th March 2025 came to be issued and thereby the previous Notification dated 20th May 2022 was withdrawn. Criticizing the Government action in withdrawing the Notification dated 20th May 2022, the petitioners have pleaded that the

Gram Panchayats with lesser population such as the Gram Panchayat Jhakhal and Gram Panchayat Dundlod are left untouched whereas a decision in respect of the Gram Panchayat Raniwada has been taken in the most arbitrary manner to reverse the declaration made under the Government Notification dated 20th May 2022 that the said Gram Panchayat shall constitute a Municipal Council.

5. Mr. S.P. Sharma, the learned counsel for the petitioners submits that creation of a Nagar Panchayat or a Municipal Council or a Municipal Corporation is not a 2-way process inasmuch as once a decision is taken to create a Municipal Council for a smaller urban area or a Municipal Corporation for a larger urban area, the said decision cannot be reversed and the newly constituted Nagar Panchayat has to be restored to its original position.

10. The impugned Notification clearly mentions that the same has been issued under the authority of the Governor of Rajasthan. The Notification dated 20th May 2022 was also issued under the authority of the Governor of Rajasthan. Section 21 of the General Clauses Act provides that a power to make rules includes a power exercisable in the like manner and subject to the like sanction and conditions, if any, to add, to amend, to vary or rescind any rules so made. In "Rasid Javed & Ors. v. State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr." (2010) 7 SCC 781, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that the authority which has power to issue a notification has undoubted power to rescind or modify it in the like manner. In paragraph no. (1) of the reported judgment in "Shree Sidhballi Steels Limited & Ors. v. State of Uttar Pradesh & Ors." (2011) 3 SCC 193, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as under:-

"41. By virtue of Sections 14 and 21 of the General Clauses Act, when a power is conferred on an authority to do a particular act, such power can be exercised from time to time and carries with it the power to withdraw, modify, amend or cancel the notifications earlier issued, to be exercised in the like manner and subject to like conditions, if any, attached with the exercise of the power. It would be too narrow a view to accept that chargeability once fixed cannot be altered. Since the charging provision in the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 is subject to the State Government's power to issue notification under Section 49 of the Act granting rebate, the State Government, in view of Section 21 of the General Clauses Act, can always withdraw, rescind, add to or modify an exemption notification. No industry can claim as of right that the Government should exercise its power under Section 49 and offer rebate and it is for the Government to decide whether the conditions are such that rebate should be granted or not."


11. In that view of the matter, we see no reason to interfere in this matter and, accordingly, D.B. Civil Writ Petition No.8177 of 2025 is dismissed."

In view of the judgment cited above, the said ground of challenge is also not sustainable.

CONCLUSION

148. The conclusion emerges from the discussions made above, can be summed up as under :-

- i) The power of the Government in issuing delimitation notifications is in the nature of conditional legislation.
- ii) The scope of interference by the Constitutional Court in the matters of delimitation is limited to the scope of judicial review and the same can only be exercised in rarest of rare cases on establishment of proof of manifest arbitrariness or the decision being irreconcilable to the Constitutional values.
- iii) The guidelines issued along with the notices for delimitation are not statutory in nature and thus, are not enforceable in law.
- iv) The final delimitation notifications once issued, cannot be interfered with merely on the ground of non-adherence of the guidelines relating to population / distance criteria alone, where the decision has been taken after holistic consideration of various factors as per the constitutional scheme.
- v) The writ petitions challenging the delimitation notifications cannot be dismissed merely on the ground of *locus standi* of the petitioners.



- vi) The authorities considering the objections / suggestions received in pursuance of the notices of delimitation, are not required to act as a judicial / quasi-judicial authority to decide each objections with reasoned order.
- vii) The principle of *audi alteram partem* is not applicable in the cases of delimitation.
- viii) In view of the discussions made above, with regard to different grounds raised by the petitioners in different writ petitions, as adjudicated above, no case for interference in the present bunch of writ petitions challenging the final notifications of delimitation issued under Section 3 of the Act of 2009 or under Section 101 of the Act of 1994, is made out.

PART (B) – WRIT PETITIONS CHALLENGING PROCESS OF DELIMITATION INITIED IN PURSUANCE OF ONE MONTH'S NOTICE ISSUED UNDER SECTION 101 OF THE ACT OF 1994

149. In pursuance of conscious decision taken by the State Government to undertake the process of delimitation of the Panchayati Raj Institutions, the notifications dated 10.01.2025 as well as order dated 18.01.2025 were issued directing for issuing one month notice under Section 101 of the Act of 1994 for proposed delimitation. In pursuance of said notices, objections / suggestions have been submitted by various villagers. Upon the said objections / suggestions, reports were prepared by the concerned Sub-Divisional Officer and forwarded to the concerned District Collector. In some cases, the concerned District Collector



has forwarded the record to the State Government for its consideration.

150. A large bunch of writ petitions was filed challenging the process so undertaken in pursuance of notification dated 10.01.2025 and also the proposals made in pursuance thereof. The challenge has been made on various common grounds including non-adherence of the guidelines issued along with the notice, alleged problems to be faced by the villagers, non-consideration of the objections submitted by the villagers or arbitrary exercise of powers on political considerations.

151. We have perused the record of all such writ petitions and found that the nature of the grounds raised in the writ petitions are of common nature apart from factual distinction of the respective cases. The issues / questions / ground of challenge involved in the said bunch of writ petitions are broadly summed-up and noted as infra.

- (i) After de-limitation / exclusion / inclusion of village(s), office of the proposed Gram Panchayat shall be more than 6 k.m. away from the villages.
- (ii) Two contiguous villages, which were part of existing gram panchayat have been included in newly proposed gram panchayat as there shall be no contiguity with the newly constituted gram panchayat or its constituent villages.
- (iii) The creation of new revenue villages is still in offing or subject matter of the writ petitions, in which interim orders have been passed or the notification of



creation of revenue villages have been quashed, yet gram panchayat(s) has/have been proposed with inclusion of such villages.

- (iv) The population criteria given in the Guidelines dated 10.01.2025 is not met in the proposed gram panchayat.
- (v) The petitioners apprehend that there is likelihood that the Collector would agree to their proposal and send recommendation against the proposed gram panchayat yet the State Government would create such gram panchayat because of political vendetta or vested interest.
- (vi) Abolition of gram panchayat or its division in two gram panchayats is not permissible in the eye of law.
- (vii) A village having lesser population has been fixed as gram panchayat as against village with greater population.
- (viii) The headquarter of gram panchayat has been proposed in a village where sufficient land is not available for development of essential amenities.
- (ix) The headquarter of gram panchayat has been proposed in a village other than the one where sufficient development has taken place and government land is available for development of panchayat head office and other amenities, which is in defiance of the Guidelines dated 10.01.2025.

152. Record of the cases revealed that a bunch of writ petitions lead by **S.B. Civil Writ Petition No.8576/2025 (Dhanna Ram**



and Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.), the Single Bench of this Court at Principal Seat, Jodhpur has passed an interim order dated 23.05.2025 and issued directions. For ready reference, order dated 23.05.2025 is quoted below :-

"2. It is informed by learned Advocate General that a three Members High Level Committee has been constituted by the State Government, which is supposed to examine the proposals sent by the respective Collectors and the proposal sent by the Collector is not final.

3. As per the Guidelines issued from time to time, the Collector is supposed to send the proposals after considering the objections raised by the residents /concerned persons.

4. All the petitioners claim to have submitted their objections. This Court has no reason to apprehend that the concerned Collectors shall not consider lawfully and objectively their objections before sending the proposals to the State Government.

5. The high-level Committee so constituted by the State Government has been assigned the task of considering the proposals so sent by the District Collectors.

6. List these cases on 07.07.2025, as jointly prayed.

7. Meanwhile, the competent high-level Committee of the State is directed to consider the objections qua all the writ petition spending here, list whereof shall be supplied to them by the office of Advocate General. While doing so, the Committee shall decide the proposals so sent by the Collectors in terms of the Guidelines dated 10.01.2025 and other guidelines issued from time to time so also the issues/questions, which this Court has highlighted hereinabove.


8. The State shall not notify the creation of gram panchayats until the adjudication made by the above referred Committee is placed for consideration of the Court."

153. The said interim order dated 23.05.2025 has been challenged on behalf of the State Government in **D.B. Special Appeal Writ No.831/2025: State of Rajasthan & ors. Vs. Dhanna Ram and Ors.** which will be dealt by us in the later part of the judgment.



154. While objecting the maintainability of the said writ petition, learned AG argued that the said writ petitions are liable to be dismissed solely on the ground that the same being premature. Learned Advocate General contended that the writ petitions are based upon misconceived apprehension. The basic ground of challenge in the writ petitions is in reference to the guidelines / instructions issued vide notification dated 10.01.2025, however the said guidelines are not statutory in nature and therefore having no enforceability under the law. Learned Advocate General also contended that no vested right of the petitioners are violated, hence, the writ petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution of India are not maintainable. It is also stated that merely because objections have been filed by few of the villagers and the writ petitions are being filed by a few amongst them, cannot give rise to a presumption that the proposal of delimitation is against interest and sentiments of public at large. Learned Advocate General further stated that the procedure as provided under the provisions of Act of 1994 was duly followed and in view of the statement made before the learned Single Bench, all the proposals will be considered by a High Level Committee while keeping in mind the constitutional as well as statutory mandate. Learned Advocate General, thus, prayed for dismissal of the said bunch of writ petitions.

155. Learned Advocate General argued that, until the notification is issued, the delimitation process remains ongoing and no rights of any person are infringed; therefore, any challenge at this stage would be premature. It is contended that the scope of interference



even in the cases, where final notification of delimitation is issued, is only limited to judicial review, however, entertaining the writ petition at this stage, where final notification is yet to be passed, would amount to preview of judicial review of a process in progress, which is not permissible in the eyes of law. It was further submitted that, since the delimitation process is akin to conditional legislation, entertaining such a writ petition prematurely could open a “Pandora’s box,” potentially allowing challenges to any legislation or bill that has been tabled but not yet enacted in the Legislature.

156. We are in agreement with the objection so raised by the learned Advocate General as it has been consistently held by the Hon’ble Apex Court that the writ jurisdiction of the High Court cannot be invoked prematurely, when the administrative process remains incomplete and no final order prejudicial to legal rights of any person is issued. Writ jurisdiction can only be invoked in the cases where any action has resulted in concrete and identifiable infringement / harm and not mere upon conjecture or apprehension of anticipated consequences. The law does not countenance anticipatory challenges to any administrative / legislative / judicial processes, which is still in motion. Intermediate steps in progression, do not constitute the crystallized decision warranting judicial scrutiny under Article 226 of the Constitution. Reliance can be placed on the case of ***Santosh Kumar Mallik v. State of Orissa*** reported in **2015 SCC OnLine Ori 75**, wherein several landmark judgments have been discussed in detail and has been held that court may dismiss



a petition which appears to be at a premature stage and there exist no final action affecting the rights of the parties. The relevant para has been reproduced below:


"7. The apex Court in Charan Singh v. Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Punjab, AIR 1977 SC 1821, Dr. Sarana V. University of Lucknow, AIR 1976 SC 2428, Chandra Shekhar v. State of Orissa, AIR 1972 SC 486, Union of India v. A.N. Saxena, AIR 1992 SC 1233 held that the Supreme Court or a High Court may also dismiss the petition filed by the petitioner if it is filed at a premature stage and no final action adversely affecting the rights of the petitioner is taken. Ordinarily, a Court will confine its decision to the existing facts and will not enter into assumptions and inferences. If the petitioner approaches the Court at an earlier and premature stage, the Court may dismiss the petition on that ground alone without entering into the merits of the matter.

8. In Charan Singh (supra) the Managing Director of the Bank initiated departmental proceedings against the petitioner and issued a show cause notice. The petitioner challenged the legality of the proceedings by filing a petition. It was contended by the Bank that the petition was not maintainable since no final action had been taken against the petitioner.

Upholding the contention, the Court observed that no punitive action had been taken against the petitioner. "It is difficult to state, apart from speculation, what the outcome of the proceedings will be".

9. In Dr. Sarana (supra) the petitioner approached the High Court by filing a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution against the recommendation made by the Selection Committee in favour of one of the two candidates. It was not even scrutinized by the Executive Committee. It was for the Executive Committee either to accept the recommendation made by the Selection Committee or to reject it. Thus, the petition filed against such a recommendation was held to be premature."

157. We have considered the rival contentions advanced at Bar and also perused the record of the cases. As a matter of fact, in all the said writ petitions the process of Delimitation is still underway and has not attained finality till now. The law is well settled that the writ petitions are not maintainable merely on the basis of apprehensions. Though, there is a clear constitutional bar of interference in the case of delimitation, the scope of interference



is limited to the power of judicial review under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The said power can only be exercised to check the procedural infirmity, if any, established in the decision making process and the same cannot be exercised at an intermediate stage. We are of the considered opinion that the writ petitions challenging the process of delimitation, where the final notification is not yet passed, are premature.

158. In large number of writ petitions, the ground of challenge is violation of the guidelines relating to distance criteria / population criteria. As held above, the guidelines so issued along with the notice under Section 101 of the Act of 1994 are not statutory in nature and only administrative instructions providing guiding principles for considering the proposals of delimitation by administrative authorities. Therefore, the challenge given in the present bunch of writ petitions on such grounds is not sustainable in the eye of law.

159. The other grounds raised in the writ petitions involve various disputed questions of fact, which cannot be decided under writ jurisdiction by this Court. Even as per the constitutional as well as statutory scheme, it is within the domain of the authorities to consider and decide the proposals of delimitation and this Court cannot shift its opinion in such matters.

160. During the course of arguments, learned Advocate General has maintained the stand of the State Government, as recorded in the Para 2 & 3 of the order dated 23.05.2025 that the proposals sent by the concerned District Collector will be considered by a High Level Committee constituted for that purpose. This Court



cannot presume at this stage that the said proposals will not be considered by the Committee in an objective manner keeping in view of the constitutional mandate. In this view of matter, no interference of this Court at this stage, in said bunch of writ petitions is called for.

161. Arguing in relation to D.B. Civil Special Appeal No. 831/2025 (State of Rajasthan & ors. Vs. Dhanna Ram & Ors.) as well as other Special Appeals, challenging the interim order dated 23.05.2025, learned Advocate General argued that the directions contained in para 7 and 8 of the said order dated 23.05.2025 amounts to transgressing the powers of judicial review of the legislative functions of the State Government. Learned Advocate General contended that learned Single Judge has failed to consider that the notices issued under Section 101 are only in the nature of intimation to the public at large; the representations submitted in pursuance thereof are in only in the form of suggestions and the proposals forwarded by the District Collector are recommendatory in nature. The directions contained in the order dated 23.05.2025, for adjudicating the objections and to place the decision before the High Court for scrutiny is against the constitutional and statutory scheme. Learned Advocate General further submitted that there is no provisions requiring for adjudication of objection submitted in pursuance of notice for delimitation, therefore, the directions contained in para 7 and 8 of the order dated 23.05.2025 are not sustainable.

162. Learned counsel for the writ petitioners have argued that as a matter of fact, the order dated 23.05.2025 has been passed



with the consent of the learned Advocate General and therefore, such consent order cannot be allowed to be challenged. Learned counsels for the writ petitioners stated that order dated 23.05.2025 is required to be maintained as it is and writ petitioners will be satisfied, if the directions contained in the said order is allowed to be followed in its true letter and spirit.

163. We have considered the submissions made at bar and found that on bare reading of the order dated 23.05.2025, it is clear that the statement / consent of the learned Advocate General is recorded in para 2 and 3 of the said order and the same are limited to the extent that as per the guidelines, the Collector is supposed to send the proposals after considering the objections raised by the residents / concerned persons and a three Members High Level Committee has been constituted to examine the proposals so sent by the respective Collectors. There is no consent given on behalf of the learned Advocate General regarding the directions contained in para 7 and 8 of the said order and therefore, present special appeals to the extent of challenging the said directions are very much maintainable.

164. We are of the considered opinion that once it is clearly stated before the learned Single Bench that the proposals sent by the District Collector are not final and even the learned Single Judge has recorded its finding in Para 4 of the said order that *"This Court has no reason to apprehend that concerned Collectors shall not consider lawfully and objectively their objections before sending proposals to the State Government"*, there was no




justification available in issuing further directions as contained in para 7 and 8 of the order dated 23.05.2025.

165. As discussed in the earlier part of this Judgment, the process of delimitation is in the nature of conditional legislation and the authority undertaking the same i.e. three Members High Level Committee in the present case, is not supposed to act as a judicial or quasi-judicial authority. Similarly, the representations made by the villagers are only in the form of the suggestions and there is no statutory requirement to adjudicate the objections and decide each such objections with reasoned order. As held above, the recommendations made or decision taken by the committee are not amenable to writ jurisdiction except within the limited scope of judicial review. Therefore, the directions contained in para 7 and 8 of the order dated 23.05.2025 cannot be allowed to sustain.

However, it is expected from the State Government to comply with the statement made before the learned Single Judge as recorded in Para 2 and 3 of the said order.

166. We have also considered D.B. Civil Writ Petition (PIL) No.9199/2025 (Sanwar Mal Choudhary & Ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan & Ors.), wherein the petitioners have alleged that the District Collector, Sikar, while forwarding the final proposal to the State Government, failed to include the name of Reengus as a new Panchayat Samiti and confined the recommendation only to the reconstitution of Khandela Panchayat Samiti, thereby ignoring the proposal made by the Block Development Officer and the representations submitted by several Gram Panchayats.




Per contra, learned Advocate General submitted that the delimitation exercise is undertaken strictly in accordance with law and after due consideration of all relevant factors. It was contended that the proposal for creation of Reengus Panchayat Samiti did not satisfy the criteria of population and administrative viability as per the prescribed norms, and therefore, was not recommended. It was further argued that the matter falls within the realm of administrative discretion, and unless malafide or manifest arbitrariness is shown, judicial interference is unwarranted. It is further argued that even otherwise, the process of consideration for reconstituting the Panchayat Samiti is still not finalized, therefore, no interference at this stage is called for.

167. As held above, the interference of this Court at this premature stage is not called for. The disputes as raised in the writ petition regarding adequacy and viability of creation of Reengus as a Panchayat Samiti cannot be decided by this Court. As directed above, all the pending proposals regarding delimitation shall be considered by the High Level Committee.

PART (C) - WRIT PETITIONS CHALLENGING PROCESS OF DELIMITATION / ALTERATION OF WARD BOUNDARIES IN ABSENCE OF ANY CHANGE IN CENSUS DATA OR VARIATION IN THE NUMBER OF WARDS

168. The bunch of writ petitions led by ***S.B. Civil Writ petition No.8698/2025 (Sahdev Singh Bhati & Ors. V. State of Rajasthan & Ors.)*** was filed before this Court at Principal Seat, Jodhpur challenging the proposals relating to the reorganization of ward boundaries under the Act of 2009, where there had been no change in the census or number of wards. The matter was being




heard by the learned Single Judge, and by way of an interim order dated 11.06.2025, the respondent - State was restrained and prohibited from proceeding any further in respect of the proposal or scheme formulated and communicated by the District Collector or the concerned Municipal Authorities for altering or reorganizing the territorial precincts of the wards and the corresponding number of voters enrolled therein.

Aggrieved with the said interim order, the respondent - State has preferred special appeal being ***D.B. Special Appeal (Writ) No.1005/2025 (State of Rajasthan & Ors. Vs Narayan Singh Solanki & Ors.)***. In light of the foregoing, this Court deems it appropriate and expedient to synchronously and concurrently entertain and adjudicate upon all the connected writ petitions along with the Special Appeal Writ so as to avoid contradictory decisions and to secure uniformity of judicial pronouncements in the matter.

169. Learned counsel for petitioners contend that, in absence of a fresh census enumeration, the figures derived from the 2011 Census alone are admissible and in absence of any change in the census, the initiation or undertaking of any delimitation regarding boundaries of the existing municipal wards is impermissible and constitutes a clear violation of Section 3 of the Act of 2009.

170. It is further contended that none of the contingencies enumerated in clauses (a) to (d) of Section 3(1) of the Act of 2009 have occurred, and therefore, the conditions precedent for invoking the provisions of Section 3(2) are not satisfied. Additionally, no statutory notification altering or changing the municipal boundaries has been issued by the competent authority.



Consequently, any proposal, scheme, or initiative put forth by authorities to modify, alter, or re-determine the territorial composition and boundaries of the wards is patently arbitrary, lacks statutory sanction, and is devoid of legal foundation.

171. Learned counsel for petitioners also contend that pursuant to the mandate contained in Section 6 of the Act of 2009, the total number of wards to be constituted within a municipality must be ascertained and determined exclusively on the basis of the population data as recorded in the latest Census.

Additionally, learned counsel submitted that in a case involving an almost identical factual matrix, the Division Bench of the Punjab and Haryana High Court, in ***Rajesh Kumar Sharma v. State of Punjab, 2023 SCC OnLine P&H 7307***, had elaborately considered the legal position and quashed the delimitation exercise undertaken by the respondents therein, having found the same contrary to Rule 4 of the Delimitation of Wards of Municipalities Rules, 1972, applicable in the State of Punjab, which is *pari materia* to statutes of the Act of 2009.

172. Learned Advocate General relied upon the note sheet (Annx-R/3) at page 178, which records that the entire issue was considered and a decision was taken to alter the territorial boundaries of the wards. It was stated that, after following Sections 6, 9, and 10, Section 3 was not relevant in the present case. The note further clarifies that the eventualities spelled out in Sections 3 and 6 are set out in the Act as guiding principles, but there is no prohibition against changing boundaries **from time to time**. Therefore, the boundaries of the wards were altered in the exercise of administrative power.



173. Learned Advocate General further submitted that in cases where there is no fresh Census or alteration of boundaries, Section 3 of the Act of 2009 has no bearing on the delimitation of constituencies. While Section 6(2) makes the fresh determination of constituencies (wards) mandatory, Section 6(1) authorizes the fixation of the number of seats from time to time by notification in the Official Gazette. Section 6(1) is subject to Section 6(2) in the sense that, irrespective of any prior fixation, if a fresh Census has been undertaken, re-fixation of seats must be carried out mandatorily. Therefore contending that the reading Sections 3, 6, 9, and 10 together demonstrates that the Government possesses the power to change boundaries without any statutory prohibition or restriction.

174. The preliminary objection raised by the respondent - State, contending that the writ petition is premature as it challenges a mere notification without any consequential adverse action, is devoid of merit. It is a settled principle that the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution can be invoked not only upon actual infringement of a right but also where there exists a clear violation of the statutory provisions. This Court, upon due consideration of the issue involved, finds persuasive merit in the reasoning adopted by the learned Division Bench of the Punjab and Haryana High Court in **Rajesh Kumar Sharma** (*supra*), which elaborately examined an almost identical factual and legal situation. The principles laid down therein, holding that a delimitation exercise undertaken in contravention of the governing statutory provisions cannot be sustained. In view of the similarity of facts and the sound reasoning adopted in the said decision, this



Court is of the considered opinion that the present writ petition is maintainable. The relevant paragraph of the aforesaid judgment is reproduced hereinbelow for ready reference:

"15. *The challenge in the present writ petition is to the delimitation process on the ground of colourable exercise of power and arbitrariness by the authorities as the mandate of Rule 4 of the Rules of 1972 is completely throttled in the impugned delimitation exercise. **Neither there is any alteration in the municipal limits nor there is any increase in the population. As such, the entire exercise is a nullity and suffers from incurable defect.** The respondents have completely departed from the procedure prescribed under the Rules of 1972 by creating tailor-made wards only suitable to a few to ensure their success in elections, which has resulted in disturbing the level playing field to give undue advantage to a select few. ...*

18. *The delimitation of the wards is provided under Rule 4(ii). The delimitation can only be done;*

(a) if the municipal limits are altered;

(b) if there is an increase in the population of the Municipality;

(c) if there is an abnormal variation of population or voting figures in some of the wards, which require such re-adjustment.

Admittedly, there is no alteration in the Municipal limits and perusal of the record indicates that there is no increase in the population in the subsequent impugned delimitation. The number of wards as well as the total population remains the same, as discussed in detail in preceding paragraph No. 15. Thus, the non-compliance of the Rule 4 is writ large. "

175. The reliance placed by learned Advocate General on the judgment in ***Dule Singh Vs. State of Raj.*** reported in **2019 SCC OnLine Raj 3209** does not withstand since a careful reading of the Act of 2009 and the Act of 1994 reveals that the provisions of Sections 3 and 6 of the Act of 2009 clearly make the process of delimitation contingent upon the population figures as recorded in the relevant census, whereas Sections 12, 13, and 14 of the Act of 1994 contain no such reference or dependence on census data.




176. In this context, the interpretation put forth by the learned Advocate General with respect to the scope and operation of Sections 3 ,6, 9 ,10 of the Act of 2009 is found to be wholly misconceived. This Court finds no support of the arguments advanced by the learned Advocate General for such interpretation, which runs contrary to the expressed language and legislative intent underlying the Act.

177. The statutory framework under the Act of 2009, particularly Sections 3 and 6(2), makes it manifest that any redetermination of wards or reservation of seats must be based upon the population figures ascertained in the last concluded census. In absence of a fresh census or any variation contemplated under clauses (a) to (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 3, no alteration in the territorial limits or number of wards could lawfully be undertaken. Mere use of words "time to time" does not give unbridled power to the State Government to change the boundaries of the Municipal wards at any point of time without there being any change in census or change in the number of wards or change in the territorial boundaries of the Municipality concerned. The exercise in question, therefore, appears to travel beyond the boundaries of statutory competence.

Accordingly, this Court is not inclined to uphold the legality of the procedure so adopted by the authorities, as the same appears to have been undertaken in deviation from and in disregard of the mandatory provisions contained in the Act of 2009.

PART (D) - WRIT PETITIONS CHALLENGING REMOVAL OF PANCHAYAT SAMITI MEMBERS / PRADHAN ON THE GROUND THAT THEIR RESPECTIVE ELECTORAL WARD IS INCLUDED WITHIN THE

TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION OF A MUNICIPALITY.




178. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that even if a person becomes disqualified on account of a ward being shifted from a Panchayat Samiti to a Municipality, he would nevertheless continue to hold the office of Pradhan, as the election of a Pradhan does not pertain solely to a single village or area that may subsequently fall within a Municipality due to delimitation, but represents all the Gram Panchayats within the concerned Panchayat Samiti. Therefore, the petitioners cannot be removed from the post of Pradhan merely because the village from which they were elected as a members, now stands dissolved.

Reliance was placed upon Sections 2(8), 8, 17, 30, and 38 of the Act of 1994 to contend that a person elected as Pradhan continues to discharge his duties for a full term of five years.

179. Learned Advocate General argued that Section 101(5A) provides that the provisions relating to certain principles shall be applied *mutatis mutandis* to the Panchayats; therefore, reference to the definition of “members” in this context is not justified, as membership ceases automatically by operation of law. Section 30 contains a *non obstante* clause under the Act and hence, the tenure of office is not dependent solely upon the tenure of the Panchayati Raj Institution. Section 36(5) further provides that a Pradhan must vacate office if he ceases to be a member of the Panchayati Raj Institution.

180. With regard to the consequential removal of a Pradhan due to the inclusion of a rural area into another urban local body, learned Advocate General relied upon the provisions of Section



3(8) of the Act of 2009, and Sections 101(1)(d), 101(2)(d) read with Section 101(5A), as well as Sections 30 and 36(5) of the Act of 1994. He also placed reliance on judgment passed in the case of **Ram Prasad vs. State of Rajasthan and Lal Chand Asopa vs. State of Rajasthan (S.B. CWP No. 4993/2025)**.

181. Having considered the submissions of the parties and the relevant statutory provisions, this Court finds that the contention raised by the petitioners lacks merit. The petitioners' argument that the office of Pradhan continues for a full term despite the ward or area from which he was originally elected being transferred from the Panchayat Samiti to a Municipality, is untenable.

182. The statutory provisions of the Act of 1994 relevant for the adjudication of the instant dispute are reproduced hereunder:

"30. Term of office of Members, Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson.- Except as otherwise provided in this Act-

(a) the Members and the Chairpersons of a Panchayati Raj Institution shall hold office during the term of the concerned Panchayati Raj Institution; and

(b) the Deputy Chairperson of a Panchayati Raj Institution shall hold office as long as he continues to be a member of the concerned Panchayati Raj Institution.

36. Resignation of Sarpanch, Up-Sarpanch, Panch, Pradhan, Up-Pradhan, Pramukh, Up-Pramukh and Members of Panchayat Samiti or Zila Parishad.-

(1) The Sarpanch, Up-Sarpanch or Panch may resign his office by writing under his hand addressed to the Vikas Adhikari.

(2) A member holding office as Pradhan of the Panchayat Samiti may resign his office at any time by writing under his hand addressed to the Pramukh, Zila Parishad and the Up-Pradhan or a member of a Panchayat Samiti may resign his office at any time by writing under his hand addressed to the Pradhan, Panchayat Samiti.

(3) *The Pramukh may resign his office by writing under his hand addressed to the Divisional Commissioner, and the Up-Pramukh or a member, Zila Parishad may resign his office by writing under his hand addressed to the Pramukh.*

(4) *Every resignation under Sub-secs. (1), (2) and (3) shall take effect on the expiry of fifteen days from the date of its receipt by the authority aforesaid unless withdrawn within this period of fifteen days.*

(5) *Every Up-Sarpanch, Pradhan, Up-Pradhan, Pramukh and Up-Pramukh shall vacate the office if he ceases to be a member of Panchayat or, as the case may be, a Panchayat Samiti or a Zila Parishad.*

183. The said provisions are required to be read along with Section 3 of the Act of 2009, relevant part of which is quoted below :

"3. Delimitation of Municipalities. -

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8) *When an area comprised in a village is specified as, or when any area is excluded from the village and included in, a municipal area, then with effect from the date on which such area is so specified or is so included, the following consequences shall ensue, namely: -*

(a) *such area shall cease to be a village;*

(b) *the Municipality in which such area is included or the Municipality declared for such area shall exercise jurisdiction over such area and the panchayat established for such area shall cease to function therein;*

(c) *until elections are held under sub-Section (1) or the term of the Municipality expires under this Act, whichever is earlier, the Sarpanch, Up-Sarpanch and the panch or panchas representing the area of the village so included in, or declared as a Municipality shall be deemed to be the additional members of the Municipality in which such area of the village is included or the Chairperson, Vice-*

Chairperson and the members respectively of the Municipality declared for such area, as the case may be;

(d) the whole of the assets vesting in, and of the liabilities subsisting against, the panchayat so declared to be a Municipality or in case where only a part or whole of a village is so included in a Municipality, such portion of the said assets and liabilities as the State Government may direct, shall devolve upon the Municipality declared for such area or upon the Municipality in which such area of the village is so included;

(e) the Municipality so established by the inclusion of any area of a village therein or by the declaration of a village as a Municipality, shall levy or continue to levy such of the taxes as are lawfully imposed under this Act;

(f) any such area shall cease to be subject to all rules, notifications, orders and bye-laws made under the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (Act No.13 of 1994).

(9)

(10)"

A bare reading of Section 30 of the Act of 1994, read with the *non obstante* clause therein and the provisions of Section 36(5), clearly establishes that a Pradhan must vacate office on ceasing to be a member of the Panchayati Raj Institution.

184. Furthermore, the automatic cessation of membership occurs by operation of law, when the area represented by the Pradhan is removed from the jurisdiction of the Panchayat Samiti pursuant to delimitation or inclusion within a Municipality under the Act of 2009. The principle of *mutatis mutandis* application under Section 101(5A) of the Act of 1994 further supports this legislative intent. Moreover, the applicability of Section 3(8)(c) of the Act of 2009, which is expressly confined to the Sarpanch, Up-sarpanch, and Panchas of a Gram Panchayat, who are deemed to become the Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and members, respectively, of the successor Municipality in certain circumstances. This provision



does not extend to the members of a Panchayat Samiti or Zila Parishad. In the absence of any analogous transitory provision for the Members and Pradhan of a Panchayat Samiti, the petitioners cannot claim immunity from the cessation of his term as Pradhan.

185. The authoritative decision in ***Lal Chand Asopa v. State of Rajasthan*** confirms that upon such territorial reorganization, the office of Pradhan held by a member elected from the affected area stands terminated, precluding any continuation on the basis that the Pradhan represents the entire Panchayat Samiti. Thus, the petitioners cannot continue to hold the office, once the ward has ceased to be part of the Panchayat Samiti and the petitioners' contention to the contrary is accordingly rejected. The relevant portion of the judgment in Lal Chand Asopa (supra) is extracted hereinbelow for ready reference:

"36. Upshot of publication of notification dated 07.11.2024 is, that the entire block of Gram Panchayat, Napasar stood excluded from Panchayat Samiti, Bikaner. There is no dispute about the fact that the Panchayat Samiti, Bikaner used to comprise of 21 wards, out of which ward nos.9 and 10 were from Gram Panchayat, Napasar. Since revenue area of Napasar itself has ceased to remain a revenue area or panchayat area and has become an urban area and declared as a Municipality, these wards (ward nos.9 and 10) have ceased to exist by operation of law.

37. Since the entire area of Gram Panchayat, Napasar has ceased to remain as panchayat area and converted to municipal area, Section 101(2)(d) of the Act of 1994 comes into play which correspond to clause(d) of sub-section(1) of Section 101 of the Act of 1994. A simple reading of such provision suggests that in such eventuality, the Panchayat shall stand dissolved and the members, who represent the local area excluded from the Panchayat Circle shall stand removed.

38. The provision contained in Section 101(2)(d) not only deals with the members of a Gram Panchayat but

also provides that the members who represent the local area excluded from Panchayat Circle shall stand removed. Hence, the petitioner who was elected from Ward No.9 so also other member, namely Kishan who was elected from Ward No.10 of such Panchayat Samiti (representing Napasar - excluded from Panchayat Circle) have to be given adieu, as a fallout of issuance of the impugned notification(s)/orders.

42. This Court also does not find any substance in petitioner's contention based on clause (c) of sub-section(8) of Section 3 of the Act of 2009 that his term should also be saved. Section 3(8)(c), which is a transitory provision clearly confines its applicability to the Sarpanch, Up-sarpanch and the Panch or Panchas of the Gram Panchayat and provides that they shall be Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and the members of the Municipality of such area. This provision does not apply to members of Panchayat Samiti and Zila Parishad at all. Since, neither any transitory provision of like nature could be made nor the same has been provided for Members and Pradhan of Panchayat Samiti, the petitioner cannot claim immunity from cessation of his term on the post of Pradhan."

186. Upon a comprehensive consideration of the rival submissions, statutory provisions and judicial precedents, this Court concludes that statutory framework under the Act of 1994 and the Act of 2009 unequivocally provides that when an area is excluded from the jurisdiction of a Panchayat Samiti and included within a Municipality, the Pradhan / Member of Panchayat Samiti representing such area automatically cease to hold office by operation of law. Therefore, the petitioners cannot claim to continue in office after exclusion of their respective areas from the Panchayat Samiti.

187. While challenging the removal of Pradhan, in some writ petitions, the challenge has also been given to the consequent appointment of a candidate as Pradhan, who earlier lost the elections on the said post. Counsel for the petitioners stated that



in case of removal of Pradhan, the charge was required to be given to the Up-Pradhan, whereas, due to political motives, the charge has been given to a defeated candidate.

Replying to the said contention, learned Advocate General stated that in all the cases, on removal of a Panchayat Samiti Member, the charge has been given strictly in accordance with law and it is only in the cases, where the seat of Panchayat Samiti Member was reserved for a particular category, such as, female or reserved category, then as per the statutory mandate, the charge could not have been given to the Up-Pradhan / Up-Zila Pramukh, rather, the same has to be given to a member belonging to the same category.

188. The petitioners have failed to showcase that any infirmity or illegality or violation of statutory provisions in such action of the State Government. In this view of the matter, the said challenge also fails.

PART (E) - WRIT PETITIONS CHALLENGING ORDERS PASSED BY THE STATE GOVERNMENT APPOINTING THE OUTGOING SARPANCH AS ADMINISTRATOR OR WRIT PETITIONS SEEKING APPOINTMENT OF ONGOING CHAIRPERSON OF MUNICIPALITY AS ADMINISTRATOR

189. In this part, we will deal the question as to whether the appointment of an outgoing Sarpanch as an Administrator under Section 95(1)(b) of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994, is a legally valid exercise of statutory power, especially when the analogous provision for Urban Local Bodies (Section 322 of the Act of 2009) designates government officials for such roles ?

190. Learned counsels for the petitioners while challenging the appointment of administrators, have argued that upon the




completion of the tenure of a Gram Panchayat, the Sarpanch has been appointed as the Administrator, whereas, in the case of a Municipality, a Government official has been appointed as the Administrator.

191. Learned counsel for another petitioners submitted that the appointment of an Administrator for a Municipality does not fall within the jurisdiction of the State Government. Reliance has been placed upon the judgments delivered in **Municipal Board, Begun and ors. Vs. State of Rajasthan and Ors** reported in **1991 AIR Rajasthan 14; Kishansingh Tomar vs. Municipal Corporation** reported in **(2006) 8 SCC 352** and **Sau. Durgeshwari Rajesh Kale vs State of Maharashtra and ors.** reported in **2021 (3) AIR BomR 476.**

Moreover, learned counsels for the petitioners have argued that the outgoing Sarpanch or Ward Panch could not have been appointed as Administrators, and that such action is arbitrary and bears no nexus to the object sought to be achieved. It was contended that the continuation of the existing body beyond its tenure of five years is contrary to the mandate contained in Article 243E of the Constitution of India.

It was further submitted that even an Administrator cannot be permitted to continue for a period exceeding six months after the dissolution of a Panchayat.

192. Learned Advocate General has argued that the power to appoint Administrators is strictly in consonance with Section 95 of the Panchayati Raj Act and Section 320 of the Municipalities Act. Under the Panchayati Raj Act, the power of appointment of an Administrator is not confined only to Government officers. He



further submitted that Section 95(1)(b) of the Act of 1994 and Section 322(3)(b) of the Act of 2009 provide for the appointment of Administrators in the event of dissolution of local bodies. Both these provisions apply to all kinds of dissolutions under their respective Acts and are not limited merely to premature dissolutions under Section 94 of the Act of 1994 or Section 322 of the Act of 2009.

It was contended that dissolution may also occur under Sections 17 and 101 of the Act of 1994, and under Sections 7 and 3 of the Act of 2009, i.e., either by efflux of term or by alteration of boundaries. In such situations, since the office-bearers and members cease to hold office, the appointment of Administrators becomes a necessary consequence.

It was further submitted that the requirement of holding elections within six months applies only in cases of premature dissolution or establishment of a new local body, and not to dissolution on completion of the regular term. The by-elections in cases of premature dissolution have already been scheduled and conducted.

193. Learned Advocate General further pointed out that Section 95(1)(b) of the Act of 1994 does not mandate that the Administrator must be a Government officer or employee, whereas Section 322(3)(b) of the Act of 2009 does contain such a stipulation. Under Section 95, the term used is "such person," which implies that any suitable individual may be appointed. It was argued that the outgoing Chairpersons are the most appropriate persons to be appointed as Administrators, being former public representatives with experience in the

administration of the concerned local body for the preceding five years. Such an arrangement, it was submitted, prevents bureaucratic usurpation and ensures uniform application across the board without political bias.

194. For proper appreciation, relevant provisions of above-mentioned statutes are reproduced below:

"243E. Duration of Panchayats, etc.—(1) *Every Panchayat, unless sooner dissolved under any law for the time being in force, shall continue for five years from the date appointed for its first meeting and no longer.*

(2) *No amendment of any law for the time being in force shall have the effect of causing dissolution of a Panchayat at any level, which is functioning immediately before such amendment, till the expiration of its duration specified in clause (1).*

(3) *An election to constitute a Panchayat shall be completed—*

(a) *before the expiry of its duration specified in clause (1);*

(b) *before the expiration of a period of six months from the date of its dissolution:*

Provided that where the remainder of the period for which the dissolved

Panchayat would have continued is less than six months, it shall not be necessary to hold any election under this clause for constituting the Panchayat for such period.

(4) A Panchayat constituted upon the dissolution of a Panchayat before the expiration of its duration shall continue only for the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Panchayat would have continued under clause (1) had it not been so dissolved.

95. Consequences of dissolution.- (1) *When a Panchayati Raj Institution is dissolved under this Act, following consequences shall ensue:-*

(a) *all the members of the Panchayati Raj Institution including the Chairperson shall, on the date of dissolution vacate their respective offices but without prejudice to their eligibility for re-election or re-appointment.*

(b) *all powers and duties of the Panchayati Raj Institution shall, during the period of dissolution, be exercised and performed by such administrator as the State Government may appoint in this behalf; and*

(c) all property vested in the Panchayati Raj Institution shall, during the period of dissolution, vest in the Government.

(2) If it shall not be possible to reconstitute the Panchayati Raj Institution within the time specified in Clause (b) of Sub-sec. (3) of Sec. 17 because of any stay by any competent court or authority on any general election to the Panchayati Raj Institution concerned and the proceedings consequent thereof the consequences specified in Clause (b) and (c) of Sub-sec. (1) shall follow.

(3) An order of dissolution made under Sec. 94 together with a statement of the reasons thereof shall be laid before the House of the State Legislature, as soon as may be, after it has been made.

322. Power of Government to dissolve Municipality in case of incompetency or having less than two third elected members. - (1) If at any time the State Government is satisfied that the Municipality is not competent to perform, or persistently makes default in the performance of the duties imposed on it by or under this Act or otherwise by law, or has exceeded, or abused its powers, the State Government may, by an order published along with the reasons thereof, in the Official Gazette, declare the Municipality to be incompetent or in default, or to have exceeded or abused its powers, as the case may be, and may dissolve such Municipality as from a date to be specified in the order of dissolution:

Provided that no action shall be taken under this sub-Section unless the Municipality through its Chairperson has been afforded a reasonable opportunity of submitting an explanation and of being heard, if the Municipality so desires:

Provided further that no order under this sub-Section shall be passed

(i) unless the State Government has drawn up a statement setting out distinctly the charges against the Municipality and sent the same for inquiry in the prescribed manner and findings to a Tribunal consisting of a Chairman and not less than two members, constituted in the prescribed manner, or

(ii) otherwise than in conformity with such findings.

Explanation.- If for any reason the number of vacancies in a Municipality exceeds two-thirds of the total number of seats, the Municipality shall be deemed to be not competent to perform the duties imposed on it by or under this Act.

(2) The State Government shall dissolve the Municipality if at any time the number of its elected members falls short of two third of its total members.

(3) When a Municipality is dissolved under sub-Section (1) or any other provision of this Act, the following consequences shall ensue:

(a) all members of the Municipality including the Chairperson and the Vice-Chairperson shall, on the date specified in the order of dissolution, vacate their respective offices but without prejudice to their eligibility for re-election or re-appointment; and

(b) all powers and duties of the Municipality shall, during the period of dissolution, be exercised and performed by such officer as an Administrator as the State Government appoints in this behalf.

(4) An election to constitute a Municipality shall be completed before the expiration of a period of six months from the date of its dissolution:


Provided that where the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Municipality would have continued is less than six months, it shall not be necessary to hold any election under this sub-Section for constituting the Municipality for such period.

(5) A Municipality constituted upon the dissolution of Municipality before the expiration of its duration shall continue only for the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Municipality would have continued under Section 7 had it not been so dissolved.

(6) An order of dissolution made under this Section together with statement of the reasons thereof shall be laid before the House of the State Legislature, as soon as may be, after it has been made."

195. The petitioners' challenge, which is predicated on Article 243E of the Constitution, is untenable. The role and capacity of an elected member of a Panchayat are fundamentally distinct from those of an administrator appointed under a statute. Article 243E, which governs the duration of a duly elected Panchayat, has no applicability to an appointment made to fill an administrative vacuum.

196. The constitutional mandate under Article 243E to hold elections within six months primarily governs cases of premature dissolution or formation of new local bodies. Where the term expires naturally, the appointment of an Administrator, even one




who is a former office bearer, to administer the body temporarily is permissible and does not breach constitutional or statutory provisions.

The petitioners' reliance on judgments such as ***Municipal Board, Begun*** (*supra*); ***Kishansingh Tomar*** (*supra*) and ***Sau. Durgeshwari Rajesh Kale*** (*supra*) is inapposite, given these cases arose from very different circumstances and legal issues.

197. The appointment of administrators is governed by Section 95 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994. The said provision confers discretionary power upon the State to appoint "such administrator as the State Government may appoint in this behalf". The State has exercised this statutory power and provided a rational justification for appointing the outgoing office-bearers, citing their institutional knowledge and experience as crucial for maintaining administrative continuity. The petitioner's allegation of the action being arbitrary and tainted with mala fides is wholly misconceived, especially in light of the fact that this measure has been implemented as a uniform, state-wide policy, thereby negating any suggestion of arbitrariness or improper motive.

198. Conversely, Section 322(3)(b) of the 2009 Act mandates the appointment of a "such officer" as Administrator for Municipalities. This deliberate distinction reflects a rational legislative intent considering the differing administrative structures and needs of these local bodies. It is a cardinal principle of statutory interpretation that where the language of a provision is plain, clear, and unambiguous, effect must be given to its ordinary and grammatical meaning, as the legislative intent is best discerned from the express words used. The legislature, in its



wisdom, has conferred discretionary power upon the State Government to appoint an officer as it deems fit, and to read it in any other manner such as precluding the appointment of a Government officer would amount to rewriting the statute, which is impermissible. Therefore, the appointment of the said Government officer is squarely in conformity with the explicit mandate of the statute. In this view of the matter, the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner are rejected.

199. The contention that the appointment of Government officers as Administrators in Urban Local Bodies renders the appointment of Administrators in Panchayati Raj Institutions, as per the impugned notifications, arbitrary or unjustified, cannot be accepted. The Urban Local Bodies and the Panchayati Raj Institutions constitute distinct and separate classes, as is evident from the provisions of the Constitution as well as the respective enactments governing their composition, functions, and administration. Consequently, the nature of appointments made in Urban Local Bodies and Panchayati Raj Institutions cannot be equated, and the differentiation in the method adopted stands on reasonable classification founded on intelligible differentia having a rational nexus with the object sought to be achieved.

200. In view of the above discussion, this Court holds that in the present cases, the orders of appointment of Administrator are in accordance with the provision of the Act of 1994 and Act of 2009 and do not violate constitutional or statutory provisions, therefore, the interference of this in these cases is not called for.

**PART (F) - WRIT PETITIONS CHALLENGING / SEEKING
DIRECTION FOR FIXING OF VILLAGE HEADQUARTER**



201. Learned counsel for the petitioners argued that the guidelines issued by the State on 10.01.2025 and 13.02.2025 have been disregarded. It was submitted that these guidelines mandate that headquarters of a newly created Gram Panchayat should, as far as possible, be established in a village with adequate means of transportation to ensure convenient access for all residents of the Gram Panchayat concerned. It was further contended that the designated village must have government offices and other essential facilities, including a School, Panchayat Bhawan, Anganwadi Center, Patwar Bhawan and Kisan Seva Sadan, for which sufficient land ought to be available. However, it is submitted that in the present matter, the prescribed 6 km distance parameter and other foundational guidelines for delimitation have been violated. The petitioners assert that there was no administrative necessity to conduct the current delimitation exercise, rendering it arbitrary.

202. Learned Advocate General countering the petitioner's contentions, submitted that the provisions of Sections 101(1) and 101(6) of the Act of 1994 manifest that the Government is empowered to issue orders and directions; however, learned Advocate General further submitted that the provisions contained in the guidelines are only meant to guide the concerned officers regarding the manner of preparing proposals, and therefore, such guidelines cannot be treated as having statutory force.

203. It was further contended that Section 102 of the Act lays down the procedure for framing rules, and unless any provision is made under such Rules and published in the Official Gazette, it




cannot be enforced. As there exists no such prescription, the Government has not framed any rules in this regard. Consequently, non-compliance with the guidelines by the officers cannot be a ground for this Court to interfere with the functioning of the Government. Learned Advocate General also relied upon the definition of the term "**prescribed**" under Section 2(19) of the Act of 1994 and Section 32(58) of the General Clauses Act, 1955.

204. It is to be noticed that in the case of **J. R. Raghupathy v. State of Andhra Pradesh** reported in **AIR 1988 SC 1681**, the matter involved the State of Andhra Pradesh's decision on locating Mandal headquarters, which the High Court had interfered with by directing a different location based on its own assessment of public convenience. Hon'ble Supreme Court overturned this, ruling the High Court's intervention as patently illegal. It was held that guidelines issued by the government to its officers for determining such locations are merely administrative instructions and do not possess statutory force unless published as law. Consequently, these guidelines do not create enforceable legal rights for citizens, and a writ of mandamus cannot be issued to enforce them. The Court emphasized that the ultimate decision-making authority rests with the government, which is entitled to deviate from its own guidelines for reasons of administrative convenience. The judiciary cannot act as an appellate authority to evaluate the comparative merits of different locations for an administrative headquarters, as such a function falls squarely within the executive's domain.



205. In the present batch of petitions, the challenge is premised upon the alleged non-adherence to the guidelines dated 10.01.2025 and 13.02.2025, which lay down certain criteria regarding population, distance from headquarters and the availability of public facilities. The arguments advanced by the learned Advocate General, citing Sections 101 and 102 of the Act of 1994, find strong support in the abovementioned case of *Raghupathy (supra)*. These guidelines, having not been framed and published as "rules" under the prescribed statutory procedure, remain within the domain of executive guidelines / instructions. Their purpose is to provide a uniform framework for the authorities preparing proposals, not to create a rigid and inflexible legal mandate that can be challenged in the court upon every minor deviation. Therefore, the decision-making process for reorganisation and the selection of a Gram Panchayat headquarters is an intricate administrative function, dependent on a multitude of factors that include administrative convenience, geographical contiguity, public accessibility and local demands. It is not the province of this Court, in the exercise of its powers of judicial review, to undertake a comparative evaluation of the merits of one village over another for being designated as a headquarters. To do so would be to effectively step into the shoes of the executive and substitute the Court's own wisdom for that of the administration, a path that is impermissible in law.

206. Further reliance is placed upon the judgment rendered in the case of ***Mod Singh and others v. State of Rajasthan and another (S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 6132 of 1992)***, decided




on 23.12.1994. For ready reference, the relevant paragraphs of the said judgment are quoted below:

"35. In D. B. Civil Special Appeal No. 854/ 93, Suraj Mai Meena v. State of Rajasthan decided on 7-11-1994 by this Court at Jaipur Bench, earlier, there existed Gram Panchayat, Fusod consisting of 12 villages with its Head Quarter at Fusod. The said panchayat circle also included villages Shanawada and Ron. Thereafter, the State Government vide Its notification dated 10-9-92 bifurcated the said Gram Panchayat, Fusod into two Gram Panchayats one with the Headquarter at village Dungarli and other in village Shanawada and village Ron was included within the jurisdiction of Gram Panchayat, Shanawada. The residents of village Ron filed a writ petition for a direction to the State Government to establish the headquarter of Gram Panchayat, Shanawada at village Ron. That writ petition was dismissed by the S. B. The Division Bench dismissing the Special Appeal held that the court cannot direct the State Government to have the headquarter of a Gram Panchayat at a particular place and if at all, the petitioner was aggrieved, he could make representation to the State Government and it was for the State Government to consider that matter and not for the Court.

36. In S. B. Civil Writ Petition No. 5009/94 "Kantilal v. State ", the villagers of Todi Chhoti which was included in Gram Panchayat, Saranpur, challenged the State notification dated 10-9-92 on the ground that their village was 10 kms. away from the headquarter, Saranpur and, as such, their village should not be included in that panchayat circle. This Court by its order dated 26-10-1994 dismissed the said writ petition holding that provisions of the Act authorised the State Government to constitute the Panchayat and that simply because a particular village was situated 10 kms., away from the headquarter, the inclusion of that village in the Gram Panchayat cannot be said to be mala fide act or arbitrary act on the part of the State Government."

207. Accordingly, this Court holds that non-observance or deviation from the guidelines does not vitiate impugned delimitation process or the determination of the Gram Panchayat headquarters. The petitioners, therefore, fail to establish any



illegality or procedural infirmity warranting interference in the exercise of powers of judicial review.

**PART (G) - WRIT PETITIONS SEEKING DIRECTIONS TO DECLARE
/ HOLD THE ELECTIONS.**

208. In ***D. B. Civil Writ Petition (PIL) No.4686/2025 [Sanyam Lodha Vs. State of Rajasthan]*** as well as ***D.B. Civil Writ Petition (PIL) No. 1285/2025 (Giriraj Singh Devanda vs. State of Rajasthan)***, apart from the other prayers, the principally directions have been sought to hold the elections of Municipalities and Panchayati Raj Institutions, respectively, immediately on completion of tenure of concerned local body.

209. Learned counsels for the petitioners have argued that Article 243E of the Constitution of India provides the duration of Panchayat shall be for five years only and 243E (3) provides that an election to constitute a Panchayat shall be completed before the expiry of its tenure. Further, Article 243K(1) vests the State Election Commission with the power of superintendence, direction, and control over the preparation of electoral rolls, and obliges it to complete elections before the expiry of the tenure. Similarly, tenure of five years is provided for municipalities under Article 243U of the Constitution of India and 243U(3) requires completion of election of municipalities before expiry of its duration. Similar power of Superintendence and control regarding conduct of election to the municipalities is provided to the State Election Commission under Article 243ZA of the Constitution of India. Counsels for the petitioners submitted that postponing the elections by issuing the impugned notification is ultra vires to the



Constitutional provision. It is also contended that the State Election Commission has failed to discharge this constitutional mandate. Counsels further submitted that in no eventualities the tenure of the Panchayati Raj Institution or Municipalities can be extended nor the elections can be postponed beyond the durations provided under the Constitution of India.

210. In support of the said contention, reliance was placed upon the judgment passed in the case of **Suresh Mahajan vs. State of Madhya Pradesh & Anr** reported in **(2022) 12 SCC 770**.

Relevant part of the judgment is reproduced below :-

"7. Thus, all concerned are obliged to ensure that the newly elected body is installed in every local body before the expiry of 5 (five) years' term of the outgoing elected body. Even in case of dissolution before the expiry of five period, where an Administrator is required to be appointed by the State, that regime cannot be continued beyond 6 (six months by virtue of relevant provisions in the respective State legislation(s).

8. This constitutional mandate is inviolable. Neither the State Election Commission nor the State Government or for that matter the State Legislature, including this Court in exercise of powers under Article 142 of the Constitution of India can countenance dispensation to the contrary.

11. In any case, the ongoing activity of delimitation or formation of ward cannot be a legitimate ground to be set forth by any authority much less the State Election Commission - to not discharge its constitutional obligation in notifying the election programme at the opportune time and to ensure that the elected body is installed before the expiry of 5 (five) years term of the outgoing elected body. If there is need to undertake delimitation -which indeed is a continuous exercise to be undertaken by the concerned authority - it ought to be commenced well-in-advance to ensure that the elections of the concerned local body are notified in time so that the elected body would be able to take over the reigns of its administration without any disruption and continuity of governance (thereby upholding the tenet of Government of the people, by

the people and for the people). In other words, the amendment effected to the stated enactments cannot be reckoned as a legitimate ground for protracting the issue of election programme of the concerned local bodies.

12. Therefore, we direct the State Election Commission by way of interim order, to issue election programme without any further delay on the basis of the wards as per the delimitation done in the concerned local bodies when the elections had become due consequent to expiry of 5 (five) years term of the outgoing elected body or before coming into force of the impugned Amendment Act(s) whichever is later. On that notional basis, the State Election Commission ought to proceed without any exception in respect of concerned local bodies where elections are due or likely to be due in the near future without waiting even for the compliance of triple test by the State Government for providing reservation to Other Backward Classes. We have no manner of doubt that only such direction would meet the ends of justice and larger public interests consistent with the constitutional mandate that the local self-government must be governed by the duly elected representatives uninterrupted except in case of its dissolution before expiry of the term on permissible grounds.

18. To put it differently, completion of delimitation exercise or be it triple test formality, as the case may be, can wait if not completed well before the expiry of five years' term of the outgoing elected body, including giving enough time to the Election Commission to complete the election process within such time. Thus, the declaration of election programme cannot be delayed by the Election Commission on that account. For, it would inevitably result in creating hiatus situation upon expiry of 5 (five) years' term of outgoing elected body. Such an eventuality needs to be eschewed by all the duty-holders. A priori, it is not only a constitutional obligation of the State Election Commission but also of the State Government including of the constitutional courts."

211. Further reliance has been placed upon the judgment passed in the case of **Kishan Singh Tomar vs. Municipal Corporation of Ahmedabad** reported in **(2006) 6 SCC 352**. The relevant part of the judgment is quoted below :-

"21. It is true that there may be certain man-made calamities, such as rioting or breakdown of law and order, or natural calamities which could distract the authorities from holding elections to the Municipality, but they are exceptional circumstances and under no circumstance the Election Commission would be justified in delaying the process of election after consulting the State Govt. and other authorities. But that should be an exceptional circumstance and shall not be a regular feature to extend the duration of the Municipality. Going by the provisions contained in Article 243-U, it is clear that the period of five years fixed thereunder to constitute the Municipality is mandatory in nature and has to be followed in all respects. It is only when the Municipality is dissolved for any other reason and the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Municipality would have continued is less than six months, it shall not be necessary to hold any elections for constituting the Municipality for such period."

212. Replying to the said contentions, learned Advocate General argued that there is no dispute regarding the constitutional mandate regarding elections of local bodies and the same must ordinarily be held before the expiry of their tenure by virtue of Articles 243E and 243U of the Constitution of India. However, in various authoritative pronouncements, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has recognized certain exceptions, some of which are outlined as follows :


- i) The Constitution does not provide a rigid or unalterable five-year timeline. The provisions themselves contemplate the possibility of premature dissolution of local bodies.
- ii) In Kishan Singh Tomar case, while it is held that holding elections prior to the expiry of tenure is generally mandatory, the judgment, on a careful reading of paragraphs 19 and 21, recognizes that exceptional circumstances, including man-made situations, may



necessitate the postponement of elections. The crux is that elections cannot be postponed merely due to situations created by vested interests. If the situation arises for bona fide reasons, it constitutes a valid exception to the general rule.

iii) In the Jalgaon Municipal Council case, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that the mandate of Article 243U applies only when the nature of local bodies remains unchanged. Paragraphs 20 and 21 clarify that any hiatus arising from the conversion of a local body into another is unavoidable, and Article 243U cannot apply where an area of one description is converted into an area of another description. This implies that the tenure requirement applies only to a local body of the same type and its immediate successor of the same type. Consequently, the argument that the entire electoral exercise must be completed before the expiry of the previous term was rejected. This position was reiterated also in the case of Pranay Roy, where the Supreme Court allowed elections to be held after the reconstitution exercise was completed, declining to follow the High Court's directions despite the ongoing reconstitution.

213. Learned Advocate General stated that the State Government is alive to the Constitutional requirements and also committed to hold the elections of the local bodies at the earliest. However, submitted that there are bonafide and compelling reasons behind the conscious decision taken by the State Government for postponing the elections, awaiting the completion of Delimitation



exercise. Learned Advocate General stated that the said grounds clearly falls within exceptions carved out or approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in various cases while dealing with cases of similar circumstances. To substantiate the said argument, learned Advocate General has relied upon following judgments.

214. Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam Vs. Secretary, Governor's Secretariat & ors.*** reported in **(2020)6 SCC 548** has held as under :-

"10. It, thus, emerges that before the election process could begin as per the State Election Commission's Press Release dated 2-12-2019, the State of Tamil Nadu increased the number of districts from 31 to 39 and also restructured various talukas. However, with regard to posts of Chairman and Vice-Chairman of District Panchayat Councils, elections are still sought to be held only for 31 posts. This resultant incongruity has prompted the appellants to file these applications with prayers to strike down the Notification dated 2-12-2019; hold elections for the entire State comprising all 39 revenue districts; and conduct such local body elections only after completion of all legal formalities i.e. after delimitation of the newly carved districts. A specific direction has also been prayed for, to compel the respondents to first carry out delimitation, reservation, rotation processes and fulfil all other legal requirements before notifying or conducting elections of any panchayat at the village, intermediate or district level.

11. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties at a considerable length and after an in-depth analysis of various statutory provisions as well as the constitutional scheme under Part IX which envisages democratisation of grass-root level administration, we are of the view that, as per Article 243-B, panchayats have to mandatorily be constituted in a State at the village, intermediate and district levels. Article 243-C requires the State, as far as is practicable, to maintain a similar ratio between the population residing within the territory of a particular panchayat and the number of seats allocated to it, across all panchayats in the State. Further, each panchayat must be divided into territorial constituencies and per Article 243-D, seats in proportion to their population must be reserved for

Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in each panchayat.

12. It is, thus, clear that the constitutional object of Part IX cannot be effectively achieved unless the delimitation exercise for constitution of local bodies at all levels is properly undertaken. Such exercise in the State of Tamil Nadu must keep in view the criteria for delimitation of wards prescribed under the Tamil Nadu Local Bodies Delimitation Regulations, 2017 (formulated under the Tamil Nadu Delimitation Commission Act, 2017), which criteria must itself not be contrary to Article 243-C read with Article 243B(1) of the Constitution.

13. Noticing how at the completion of the delimitation process there were only 31 revenue districts, but despite a subsequent increase in number of districts to 39, no fresh delimitation exercise has been undertaken, it is clear that the State Government cannot fulfil the aforesaid constitutional mandate. There is no identified data elucidating population proportions and, hence, requisite reservation for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes cannot be provided for, both in re village panchayat wards or Chairman/Vice-Chairman of District bodies. We, hence, have no doubt that the election process as notified by the State Election Commission on 2-12-2019, in respect of the newly constituted nine districts cannot be held unless fresh delimitation exercise in respect thereto is first completed. The State Government cannot justify holding local body elections of these nine districts by relying upon this Court's order dated 18-11-2019 [C.R. Jayasukin v. T.N. State Election Commission, 2019 SCC OnLine SC 1664] as the said order itself mandates notification of elections only after completing "all legal formalities".

On the basis of said observations, the Hon'ble Apex Court in para 15 of the said judgment, has directed to first complete the Delimitation process and then to hold the elections within specified period.

"15. For the reasons aforesaid, these applications are allowed in part and disposed of with the following directions:

15.1. The Respondent authorities shall hold elections to all Panchayats at village, intermediate and district levels, except those in the following nine reconstituted districts:



- i. Kancheepuram
- ii. Chengalpattu
- iii. Vellore
- iv. Thirupathur
- v. Ranipet
- vi. Villupuram
- vii. Kallakurichi
- viii. Tirunelveli
- ix. Tenkasi;

15.2 The Respondents (including the Delimitation Commission) are directed to delimit the nine newly constituted districts in accordance with law and thereafter hold elections for their panchayats at the village, intermediate and district levels within a period of four months;

15.3 There shall be no legal impediment against holding elections for Panchayats at the village, intermediate and district levels for rest of the districts;

15.4 State Election Commission shall notify elections for the panchayats at village, intermediate and district levels in respect of all districts except the nine reconstituted districts as per the details given in direction 'a' above.;

15.5 While conducting elections, the respondents shall provide proportionate reservation at all levels, in accordance with the Rule 6 of Tamil Nadu Panchayats (Reservation of Seats and Rotation of Reserved Seats) Rules, 1995."

215. Reliance is also placed upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***State Of Maharashtra & Ors vs Jalgaon Municipal Council & Ors*** reported in **(2003) 9 SCC 371**. The relevant paras of this judgment are quoted below :-

"Q.1. Whether any hiatus between abolition of Municipal Council and constitution of Municipal Corporation is violative of Constitution Part IXA?

20. The High Court has held that keeping in view the object and purpose of enacting Parts IX and IXA of the Constitution which intended to achieve the Gandhian dream of local self-government it is necessary that before the term of Municipal Council comes to an end the Municipal Corporation should be available and in existence so as to take over the administration of the

urban area from the Municipal Council. There should be no interregnum or hiatus between the dissolution of the Municipal Council and the date of Municipal Corporation coming into existence; for such hiatus would necessarily involve a government officer being appointed an administrator and that will be subversive of the principles of democracy and local self-governance. The learned counsel for the writ petitioner-respondents placed reliance on the provisions of Article 243U(3)(a) which mandates that an election to constitute a 'municipality' shall be completed before the expiry of its duration specified in clause (1) of Article 243U which is 5 years from the date appointed for its first meeting and no longer. A municipality for the purpose of Part IXA is defined by clause (e) of Article 243P as meaning an institution of self-government constituted under Article 243Q. Article 243Q speaks of such three institutions, namely, Nagar Panchayat, Municipal Council and Municipal Corporation. All the three are included within the definition of 'municipality'. The learned counsel for the respondents submitted that the steps for constitution of Municipal Corporation should be planned and scheduled, well in advance of time of the date by which the term of existing Municipal Council is coming to an end so as to see that successor municipality, i.e. Municipal Corporation proposed to be constituted, is ready to take over from the municipality, i.e. Municipal Council proposed to be abolished without there being any hiatus in-between necessitating the appointment of an administrator to take charge in the interregnum of the two events. The learned counsel for the appellants submitted on the other hand that the process of conversion of an area from Municipal Council to Municipal Corporation would necessarily involve a hiatus which is an unavoidable necessity. Both the learned counsel read out several provisions of Part IXA of the Constitution and the two relevant statutes trying to cull out the underlying scheme each in support of their respective submissions.

21. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties at length on this aspect we are of the opinion that the said hiatus is an unavoidable event which must take place in the process of conversion of Municipal Council into a Municipal Corporation. Reliance on Article 243U by the learned counsel for the respondents in this context is misconceived. The use of expression 'a municipality' in sub-Article (3) of Article 243U in the context and in the setting in which it is employed suggests and means the duration of the same type of municipality coming to an end and the same type of successor municipality taking over as a consequence of

term of the previous municipality coming to an end. Article 243U cannot be applied to a case where the area of one description is converted into an area of another description and one description of municipality is ceased by constituting another municipality of a better description. Article 243U(3) cannot be pressed into service to base a submission on that an election to constitute a municipal corporation is required to be completed before the expiry of duration of a municipal council."

216. Learned Advocate General also referred to para 15 and 21 of the judgement passed in the case of "**Kishan Singh Tomar Vs. Municipal Corporation Ahmednagar** reported in **(2006) 8 SCC 352**.

"15. The counsel for the respondents contended that due to multifarious reasons, the State Election Commission may not be in a position to conduct the elections in time and under such circumstances the provisions of Article 243-U could not be complied with stricto sensu....

21. It is true that there may be certain man-made calamities, such as rioting or breakdown of law and order, or natural calamities which could distract the authorities from holding elections to the Municipality, but they are exceptional circumstances and under no circumstance the Election Commission would be justified in delaying the process of election after consulting the State Govt. and other authorities. But that should be an exceptional circumstance and shall not be a regular feature to extend the duration of the Municipality. Going by the provisions contained in Article 243-U, it is clear that the period of five years fixed thereunder to constitute the Municipality is mandatory in nature and has to be followed in all respects. It is only when the Municipality is dissolved for any other reason and the remainder of the period for which the dissolved Municipality would have continued is less than six months, it shall not be necessary to hold any elections for constituting the Municipality for such period."

217. Counsel for the State has relied upon the judgment passed in the case of "**State Of West Bengal Vs Pranoy Roy And Ors**"

reported in **(2015)16 SCC 248**. Relevant para of the same is reproduced below :-

"8. We find from the impugned judgment of the High Court that the High Court has directed holding of the elections primarily on the ground that once the term was coming to an end, the exercise of reconstitution of the municipal bodies should have started by the State Government much earlier and it has initiating this process at the fag end or after the term was over shows lack of bona fides on the part of the Government. To that extent the High Court may be right. However, at the same time we feel that it should not have been a ground to direct to hold the elections within a period of two months as the same is not going to serve any useful purpose. Even if elections are held, the term of the new bodies so constituted shall hardly last for few weeks or few months. The moment the said municipal bodies are reconstituted, the term of the new members, as per the proposed election, would come to an end and fresh elections will have to be held. Therefore, holding of the elections, at this stage would not be of any use....

10. This Court in (2003) 9 SCC 731 titled State of Maharashtra and Others vs. Jalgaon Municipal Council & Others though emphasise that the elections of the Municipal Corporations should be conducted before the expiry of the term of the existing tenure, but at the same time it noted certain exceptional circumstances under which such elections could be deferred. One of the circumstances specifically taken note of by the Court was reconstitution of the municipal bodies as is clear from the following passage (21 & 41) in the said judgment:

.....

11. Mr. Diwan, learned senior counsel appearing for the State Commission, though resisted the petition initially, but after some arguments he fairly states that in view of the aforesaid ground and having regard to the statement given by the learned senior counsel on behalf of the appellants that there would be reconstitution of these bodies by 15th June, 2015, the State Commission is ready to wait till the end of June, 2015 so that fresh election process in respect of reconstituted municipal bodies is undertaken after the said reconstitution exercise is complete within the time undertaken.

12. Even after there is a reconstitution of the municipal bodies, the State Government will have to determine

the number of wards in terms of Section 8 of the West Bengal State Commission Act, 1994. It is stated at the Bar by Mr. Kapil Sibal, learned senior counsel, that this would also be accomplished by 30.6.2015.

13. The Stages which are required for holding the election thereafter are (1) to delimit municipal areas into the ward as per Sections 3 and 29 of the West Bengal Municipal Elections (Reservation of seats) Rules; (2) determination of reservation of seats and (3) issuance of Notification for holding the election under the relevant statutes. These steps are to be taken by the State Election Commission as primacy to hold the election rests with the State Election Commission.

14. Thus, after the exercise is completed in the manner mentioned above, by 30.6.2015, by the State Government, the State Commission shall start its exercise for holding election in the manner mentioned above immediately thereafter. At that time if the State Commission needs police force to conduct fair and impartial election it can always send requisition for this purpose to the Central Government."

218. As per learned Advocate General, the judgment passed in the case of **Atma Singh Vs. State of Punjab** also requires relevance in the present case. The

"7. The whole purpose of delimitation of municipalities into wards is to ensure that every citizen should get a fair representation in the municipalities. When a municipality is re-constituted by the inclusion of any local area within the limits of a municipality under Sub-section (3) of Section 5 or by the exclusion of any local area from the limits of a municipality u/s 7, i.e. when there is an alteration of the limits of the municipality, there must of necessity be a division of the re-constituted municipality into new wards without which the elections cannot be held. There can be no disenfranchisement of a part of the electorate of a municipality. The question was dealt with at some length by the Gujarat High Court in Bhaichandbhai Maganlal Shah Vs. The State of Gujarat, 8 Guj LR 210: (AIR 1967 Guj 105) and it was observed:


It must follow logically and inevitably from this proposition that the Constitution of wards dividing the whole of the municipal district is a sine qua non of a valid election. If no wards at all are constituted in the municipal district, the machinery of election cannot go through and

equally the machinery of election cannot go through if wards are constituted in respect of a part of the municipal district and the other part is not divided into any ward or wards. In such a case there would be lists of voters for the wards which are constituted out of a part of the municipal district but there would be no lists of voters so far as the other part of the municipal district is concerned and no one from that part would be qualified to vote or to stand as a candidate for the election and no Councillors being elected by that part, there would be no representation of that part on the municipality. Where such a situation arises, it is difficult to see how the Municipality can be said to be a Municipality for the whole of the municipal district within the meaning of Section 9.

We approve of the view taken by the Gujarat High Court.

8. There can be no dispute with the principle that the State Government without re-constituting a municipality into new wards, cannot proceed to hold an election of councillors, when there is an extension of the municipal limits, but the difficulty is about the applicability of that principle to the facts of the present case. There is no denying the fact that the effect of the stay order passed by the learned Single Judge staying the operation of the notification issued under Sub-section (3) of Section 5 was to put the said notification in abeyance, with the result that the local areas to which it related were not brought within the municipal limits. It is also an undisputed fact that the stay order passed by the learned Single Judge was in force from August 2, 1978 to October 23, 1978. It is, however, urged that with the dismissal of the writ petition by the learned Single Judge on October 23, 1978, the impugned notification was brought into effect and, therefore, the State Government could not proceed with the election without delimitation of wards and preparation of fresh electoral rolls. We are afraid, the contention cannot be accepted."

219. While considering the rival submissions made at Bar, it is clear that even while taking into account the Constitutional mandate of holding the election before the expiry of term of local bodies, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in various cases while taking note of exceptional circumstances, has permitted the




postponement of the elections. Pendency of the Delimitation process is also considered as one such exceptional circumstance and while considering the same, the Hon'ble Apex Court has issued direction to first complete the process of Delimitation and then to hold the elections. We are in agreement with the contention of the learned Advocate General that the facts of the present case also akin to the judgments as relied upon on behalf of the State and the reason for issuing the notification for appointment of Administrator / postponement of election in the peculiar facts and circumstances of present case cannot be said to be unjustified or arbitrary.

220. The respondent-State, while justifying its action of deferment of elections to various Panchayati Raj Institutions and Urban Local Bodies, has primarily contended that the State has undertaken a massive and complex exercise for the complete reorganisation and restructuring of these local self-governing bodies across the entire State. It is submitted that this exercise was necessitated by a number of factors, including the haphazard creation and elevation of municipalities by the previous government without ensuring their financial viability, and the administrative and financial strain caused by staggered election cycles, a situation exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. The State has highlighted its policy decision, reflected in the budget presented on 10.07.2024, to constitute a High-Level Committee to recommend the restructuring and delimitation of these bodies and to examine the feasibility of a 'One State, One Election' model to save public resources.



221. The record indicates that the State Government has taken concrete steps to actualize this policy. A series of meetings of the Cabinet Sub-Committees and a High-Level Expert Committee were held to review the creation of new districts, divisions and the overall structure of rural and urban local bodies. Pursuant to these recommendations, the State has not only abolished certain newly created districts but has also issued detailed guidelines and timelines for the reconstitution and delimitation of Village Panchayats, Panchayat Samitis, Zila Parishads and Municipalities. The State's argument is that this comprehensive overhaul will result in large-scale alteration of territorial jurisdictions, dissolution of some existing bodies, creation of new ones, and changes in the very character of these institutions from rural to urban and vice-versa.

222. Consequently, the State contends that holding elections for the existing local bodies, whose form, nature, and territorial limits are subject to imminent and substantial change, would be a futile and wasteful exercise. It is argued that such elections would be for a very brief term and would squander significant public funds and administrative resources. Furthermore, any election would have to be preceded by a fresh delimitation of wards, revision of electoral rolls and determination of reservations for various categories, including for OBCs, for which an independent commission is also being constituted as per the mandate of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The State submits that this entire reorganisation is being conducted in the larger public interest to strengthen these institutions financially and functionally, and it is



committed to holding the elections expeditiously as soon as this bona fide exercise is completed.

223. Having perused the detailed contentions and the plethora of documents submitted by the respondent-State, this Court finds merit in the justification provided for the inability to adhere to the statutory election schedule. The decision to undertake a complete reorganisation of local bodies is a significant policy matter falling within the executive domain. The series of actions taken, from the formation of high-level committees to the issuance of statutory notifications and timelines for delimitation, demonstrates that the State is not merely seeking to postpone elections indefinitely but is actively engaged in a complex, large-scale administrative restructuring. The reasoning that it would be contrary to public interest to expend vast resources on elections for institutions that may cease to exist or be fundamentally altered in the near future is rational and persuasive. The underlying objective, particularly holding the elections simultaneously, represents a futuristic and economically prudent approach. Such a synchronized electoral cycle may result in substantial savings of public funds, minimization of administrative stasis caused by the recurrent imposition of the Model Code of Conduct, and the optimal deployment of state machinery.

Thus, this Court concludes that exercise of the State appears to be bona fide and aimed at achieving long-term systemic improvements in local self-governance, however, looking to the constitutional mandate, this Court deems it proper to issue appropriate directions to the State Government to hold the



elections of the Local Self Institutions without any unnecessary delay and to conduct and conclude the same in a time bound manner.

FINAL DIRECTIONS

224.1 In view of the adjudication made and conclusion drawn in Part-A of the judgment, the writ petitions challenging the final notifications issued under Section 3 of the Act of 2009 as well as Section 101 of the Act of 1994, are dismissed.

224.2 In view of the adjudication made and conclusion drawn in Part-B of the judgment, D.B. Civil Special Appeal (Writ) No.831/2025 (State of Rajasthan and Ors. Vs. Dhanna Ram and Ors.) and other special appeals challenging the interim order dated 23.05.2025 to the extent of Para 7 & 8 of the same, are allowed.

All the writ petitions challenging the process of delimitation initiated in pursuance of the notices issued under Section 101 of the Act of 1994, are dismissed.

It is directed that the concerned District Collectors shall send the proposal for delimitation to the state Government and the three members high-level committee constituted for the purpose of examining the same, shall take final decision upon the proposals for delimitation so sent by the concerned District Collectors in an objective manner. The State Government shall complete the entire exercise of delimitation on or before 31.12.2025.

224.3 In view of the adjudication made and conclusion drawn in Part-C of the judgment, the writ petitions challenging the



process of delimitation/change of boundaries of the municipal wards in absence of change of census or change in the number of wards or change in the territorial boundaries of the municipality, are allowed. The respondents are directed not to effect any change in the internal boundaries of the municipal wards in such cases.


Consequently, D.B. Special Appeal (Writ) No.1005/2025 (State of Rajasthan & Ors. Vs Narayan Singh Solanki & Ors.) filed for challenging the interim order dated 11.06.2025, is hereby dismissed.

224.4 In view of the adjudication made and conclusion drawn in Part-D of the judgment, the writ petitions challenging removal of Panchayat Samiti Member / Pradhan, on account of delimitation of respective areas / wards, are hereby dismissed.

224.5 In view of the adjudication made and conclusion drawn in Part-E of the judgment, the writ petitions relating to appointment of the administrator, are dismissed.

224.6 In view of the adjudication made and conclusion drawn in Part-F of the judgment, the writ petitions praying for fixing/nominating the village headquarter are dismissed.

224.7 In view of the adjudication made and conclusion drawn in Part-G of the judgment, D. B. Civil Writ Petition (PIL) No.4686/2025 [Sanyam Lodha Vs. State of Rajasthan] as well as D. B. Civil Writ Petition No. 1285/2025 (Giriraj Singh Devanda vs. State of Rajasthan & ors.) praying for a direction for holding the elections of Municipality or



Panchayati Raj Institutions, respectively, are disposed of with a direction to the State Government that after completing the delimitation exercise, elections of all the Local Self Bodies i.e. Panchayats as well as Municipality, shall immediately be conducted simultaneously and the entire exercise for such elections shall be completed on or before 15.04.2026.

224.8 To promote the spirit of 'Save Paper – Save Environment', the Registry of this Court is directed that, while placing a copy of this judgment in concerned files as well as while processing applications for issuance of certified copies of this judgment pertaining to any specific writ petition or special appeal, it shall issue a certified copy comprising the first page of the judgment, the relevant page showing the cause title of the respective writ petition/special appeal, and the full text of the judgment beginning from Page No.288 of this judgment.

224.9 Stay applications and all pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

224.10 A copy of this judgment shall be kept in each connected file.

(SANJEET PUROHIT),J

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA),ACTING CJ