



2026:UHC:2114

**HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL**

**Writ Petition Misc. Single No.702 of 2026**

**25<sup>th</sup> March, 2026**

Lamachaur Shram Sanvida  
Sahkari Samiti Ltd and others .....Petitioners

**Versus**

Registrar Cooperative  
Societies and others .....Respondents

-----  
Presence:-

Mr. T.A. Khan, learned Senior Advocate assisted by Mr. Mohd. Shafy, learned counsel for the petitioners.

Mr. Yogesh Pandey, learned D.A.G. for the State/respondent nos.1 to 3.

Mr. Sandeep Kothari, learned counsel for respondent no.4.  
-----

**Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.**

By means of this writ petition, the petitioners have challenged the show cause notice dated 12.03.2026, annexure no.1 to the writ petition, issued by respondent no.3-District Assistant Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Nainital, whereby the petitioners-Societies are called upon to show cause that as to why registration of the petitioners-Societies be not cancelled.

2. It is contended by learned Senior Advocate for the petitioners-Societies that notice is *void ab initio*. In order to elaborate his argument, it is submitted by him that once the election has been notified by respondent no.4-Uttarakhand Co-operative Election Tribunal, Dehradun, vide notification dated 28.02.2026 and scheduled to be held on 25.04.2026, the respondent no.3 has got no jurisdiction to issue the impugned notice dated 12.03.2026.

3. It is further submitted by learned Senior Advocate for the petitioners-Societies that once the election



has been initiated no power would lie with respondent no.3 for cancellation of the registration of the petitioners-Societies.

4. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the State/respondent nos.1 to 3 submits that by impugned notice only the petitioners-Societies were called upon to submit a reply as to why their registration be not cancelled.

5. It is further submitted by learned counsel for the respondent no.4 that the petitioners-Societies are defunct societies, therefore, notice was issued under Rule 291 of the Co-operative Societies Rules, 2004.

6. It is further submitted by learned counsel for respondent no.4 that the list of voters participating in the aforesaid election is prepared by State Authorities i.e. respondent no.3 and in order to prepare the voter list, the impugned notice was issued to show cause.

7. Learned Senior Advocate for the petitioners-Societies have placed reliance upon a judgment of this High Court in *Special Appeal No.16 of 2025, Uttarakhand Co-operative Election Tribunal Vs. Mange Ram Sirohi and another*, to submit that “the Rule of game cannot be changed once the game has been started”.

8. The above case law is not applicable in the present scenario for the reason that the notice which is impugned in the present writ petition is merely a show cause notice.

9. The submission which learned Senior Advocate for the petitioners-Societies is placing before this Court can very well be placed in reply to the notice issued by respondent no.3.



2026:UHC:2114

10. In such view of the matter no interference is warranted at this stage by this Court.

11. Accordingly writ petition stands dismissed.

12. Let a certified copy of this order be supplied to the counsel for the parties, today itself, on payment of usual charges.

**(Pankaj Purohit, J.)**  
**25.03.2026**

SK