



2026:RJ-JP:23284

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

S.B. Election Petition No. 1/2023

Purushottam Lal S/o Shri Charansingh

-----Petitioner

Versus

Ritu Banawat W/o Shri Rishi Bansal

-----Respondent

For Petitioner(s)	:	Petitioner in person
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Bipin Gupta Mr. Ravi Chirania Mr. Raj Kumar Goyal Mr. Deen Dayal Sharma

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDESH BANSAL

Order

13/02/2025

1. Heard on the application (2/2025) filed by respondent No.1 under Rule 745-Z of the Rajasthan High Court Rules, 1952 (hereinafter referred to as "the Rules of 1952").
2. In support of such application, counsel appearing on behalf of respondent No.1 has read-over Rule 745-Z before this Court and urged that the documents enclosed by petitioner along with the election petition are in Hindi language, hence, unless the petitioner does not submit a translation of the document in English, such documents may not be admitted in evidence.
3. Petitioner has replied to the application in the manner that earlier respondent No.1 moved an application, placing reliance on Rule 745-B, which talks about to conduct all proceedings of election petitions in the High Court in English. That application was dismissed by this Court vide order dated 21.11.2024; Thereagainst a Special Leave Petition No.2096/2025 was filed by



respondent No.1 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court which has also been dismissed vide order dated 27.01.2025, affirming the order dated 21.11.2024 passed by this Court. Submission of petitioner is that the proceedings of election petition includes the documents enclosed thereunder and the Rule 745-Z may also not be treated as mandatory and the application deserves to be dismissed in light of the order dated 21.11.2024.

4. Rule 745-Z of the Rules of 1952 reads as under:-

"745-Z. No document in any language other than English shall be admitted in evidence unless it is accompanied by an English translation which shall either be the official translation or a translation, the accuracy of which is certified by an advocate of the High Court. Costs of the translation shall be at the discretion of the Court."

5. This Court in the order dated 21.11.2024 has already observed that the compliance of Rule 745-B cannot be treated as mandatory. Rule 745-Z may not be read in isolation but is analogous and supplementary to Rule 745-B and the documents by parties sought to be produced in evidence in the election petition may not be put in different compartment, putting separate from the proceedings of election petition. Otherwise also, it is not the case of respondent No.1 that she is unable to understand the documents in Hindi language on which petitioner has placed reliance in support of his election petition.

6. The order dated 21.11.2024 passed by this Court in respect of rejecting the application filed by respondent, invoking Rule 745-B of the Rules of 1952, shall be treated as part and parcel of this order.



7. In that view, application (2/2025) is hereby dismissed.
8. Respondent No.1 is granted a last opportunity to file reply to the application (1/2025).
9. List the matter on 20.02.2025 in supplementary list.

(SUDESH BANSAL),J

NITIN /142