HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR

Judgment reserved on : 26/10/2026

Judgment delivered on : 2/11/2026

Judgment (full) uploaded on : 2/11/2026

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1227/2026

CNR: RJHC020983772026 | URN: SAW / 2441U / 2026

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

----Appellants

Versus

Mahendra Singh S/o Sirmohar, Aged About 53 Years, R/o Ward No.7 Village Akbarpur, Gram Panchayat Akbarpur, Panchayat Samiti Shreemahavirji, Tehsil Hindaun, District Karauli, Rajasthan

----Respondent

Connected With

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1228/2026

CNR: RJHC020983712026 | URN: SAW / 2442U / 2026

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

----Appellants

Versus

Dheeraj Jatav S/o Haricharan, Aged About 27 Years, R/o House No. 211, Ward No. 7, Shree Mahavireeji, Tehsil Hindaun District Karauli, Rajasthan.

----Respondent

D.B. Special Appeal Writ No. 1230/2026

CNR: RJHC020984292026 | URN: SAW / 2444U / 2026

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through The Principal Secretary, Panchayati Raj Department, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
2. State Election Commission, Through Its Chief Electoral Officer, Main Building Secretariat, Room No. 5213, Government Secretariat, Jaipur
3. The District Electoral Officer (Panchayats), District Bharatpur.
4. The Returning Officer, Panchayat Samiti Uchchain, District Bharatpur
5. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Uchchain, District Bharatpur
6. The Block Development Officer, Panchayat Samiti Uchchain, District Bharatpur.

----Appellants

Versus

Ravindra Singh S/o Shri Kumar Singh, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Village And Post Baridha, Uchchain, Bharatpur-321301 (Raj.)

----Respondent

For Appellant(s)	:	Mr. Rajendra Prasad, AG with Mr. Sheetanshu Sharma Ms. Divya Rathore for Mr. Kapil Prakash Mathur, AAG
For Respondent(s)	:	Major RP Singh, Sr. Adv. with Mr. Jaivardhan Singh Shekhawat Mr. Naseemuddin Quazi Mr. Tanveer Ahmed

---

DIVISION BENCH

HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. SANJAY K. AGRAWAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAMEER JAIN

C.A.V. Judgment

For sake of exposition, this judgment is divided in the following parts:-

S. No.	Particulars	Page Nos.
1.	PREFATORY NOTE	3
2.	SUBMISSIONS MADE BY THE LEARNED COUNSEL APPEARING FOR THE APPELLANTS	3-7

3.	SUBMISSIONS MADE BY THE LEARNED COUNSEL APPEARING FOR THE NON- APPELLANTS	7-11
4.	DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS	11-19

PREFATORY NOTE :

1. In view of the intertwined nature of the controversy involved, coupled with the identical factual matrix emerging in the present matters, and with the consent of the learned counsel representing the respective sides, owing to the congruence of issues and for the sake of expedient adjudication, the instant petitions are decided by this common adjudicatory judgment, the ratio *decidendi* whereof shall operate *mutatis mutandis* upon all related pleadings. For the purposes of factual clarity and narrative convenience, the averments articulated DBSAW No. 1227/2026 are adopted by this Court as the primary factual matrix for the disposal of the instant *lis.*

2. The lead case is an appeal preferred assailing the impugned order dated 01.10.2026 passed in SBCWP No. 20214/2026 whereby the writ petition of the respondents herein has been allowed, and the reservation lottery dated 24.09.2026 qua Gram Panchayat, Akbarpur, Panchayat Samiti Shri Mahaveerji have been quashed and set aside.

SUBMISSIONS MADE BY THE LEARNED COUNSEL APPEARING FOR THE APPELLANTS :

3. Learned Additional Advocate General, appearing on behalf of the appellants–State authorities, submitted that the present special appeal had been preferred assailing the order dated

01.10.2026 passed in S.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 20214/2026, whereby the writ petition filed by the respondent–writ petitioner had been allowed, the reservation lottery dated 24.09.2026 pertaining to Gram Panchayat Akbarpur, Panchayat Samiti Shri Mahaveerji, District Karauli, had been quashed and set aside, and the authorities had been directed to undertake a fresh exercise for reservation of seats in the aforesaid Gram Panchayat strictly in accordance with Rule 7 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj (Election) Rules, 1994 (hereinafter referred to as "Election Rules"), and the applicable administrative circulars.

4. Learned counsel submitted that the reservation exercise undertaken by the appellant authorities in respect of Gram Panchayat Akbarpur, Panchayat Samiti Shri Mahaveerji, District Karauli, was strictly in consonance with Rule 7 of the Election Rules, as well as the administrative circulars dated 10.08.2026, 16.08.2026 and 19.09.2026 issued by the competent authorities. It was contended that vide the impugned order the relevant statutory provisions, particularly Rule 7 of the Rules of 1994, and the aforesaid administrative circulars, were misconstrued while passing the impugned judgment dated 01.10.2026. It was further submitted that the administrative circulars dated 10.08.2026, 16.08.2026 and 19.09.2026 had been issued with the object of supplementing the existing statutory framework, since the statutory rules did not provide for the contingency arising out of the reconstitution and delimitation of Panchayat circles, particularly with regard to the procedure to be followed for reservation of seats in such circumstances. Learned counsel

contended that the administrative instructions were intended to address the aforesaid procedural vacuum and to facilitate the reservation exercise in accordance with the applicable legal framework. Accordingly, it was urged that the impugned judgment, having proceeded on an erroneous interpretation of the relevant rules and administrative circulars, was *ex facie* illegal and arbitrary and deserved to be quashed and set aside.

5. Learned counsel further submitted that the impugned order fails to appreciate that the category which had been earmarked for reservation in the last preceding election had not been reserved again in Gram Panchayat Akbarpur, Panchayat Samiti Shri Mahaveerji, District Karauli. It was, contended that the appellant authorities had duly adhered to the statutory as well as constitutional mandate of rotation of reserved seats, both in letter and in spirit, while undertaking the reservation exercise for the Panchayat elections of 2026. It was also contended that the respondent–writ petitioner did not possess any fundamental right to contest an election from a particular constituency or against a particular reservation category. On this premise, learned counsel submitted that no legal injury had been caused to the respondent by the reservation exercise undertaken by the appellant authorities and, consequently, the respondent lacked the requisite *locus standi* to challenge the reservation criteria adopted by the State authorities.

6. Learned counsel further submitted that while undertaking the reservation exercise for the Panchayat elections of 2026 in respect of Gram Panchayat Akbarpur, Panchayat Samiti Shri Mahaveerji,

the appellant State had merely continued with the old reservation cycle. It was contended that the respondent had not challenged the earlier reservation provisions or the reservation arrangements made in the preceding elections. Therefore, the respondent could not, at this stage, question the continuation of the existing reservation cycle in the absence of any challenge to the earlier provisions governing the reservation exercise. It was further submitted that the methodology prescribed for reservation of the office of Sarpanch in Panchayati Raj Institutions, particularly in respect of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, was based upon the overall population of the respective Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes within the particular Panchayat Samiti and not upon their population in an individual Gram Panchayat. Learned counsel submitted that the reservation of seats for the Other Backward Classes and women, on the other hand, was undertaken by way of draw of lots, but only after the reservation of seats for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes had first been determined. It was, contended that the reservation exercise had to be examined in the context of the distinct methodologies applicable to the respective categories, and that the interpretation adopted by the learned Single Judge did not properly account for the aforesaid distinction.

7. Learned counsel further argued that the interpretation adopted by the learned Single Judge, if allowed to operate, would give rise to a situation of complete uncertainty in the reservation of seats for Panchayati Raj Institutions. It was submitted that such an interpretation would undermine the consistency and

predictability of the reservation process and would ultimately result in defeating the constitutional spirit of rotation of reserved seats, instead of advancing the same in its true letter and spirit. Lastly, learned counsel submitted that the Panchayati Raj election programme/schedule had been published on 03.10.2026, whereupon the electoral process had formally commenced. It was contended that, in view of the commencement of the election process, the learned Single Judge ought not to have entertained or continued proceedings having the effect of interrupting, postponing or paralysing the ongoing electoral process. In this regard, learned counsel placed reliance upon Article 243-O of the Constitution of India and submitted that the constitutional provision expressly bars judicial interference in Panchayat elections except by way of an election petition presented in the manner prescribed by law. It was urged that the proceedings culminating in the impugned judgment were liable to be set aside, particularly in view of the commencement of the electoral process and the constitutional restriction upon interference with elections through proceedings other than an election petition. In support of the submissions made learned counsel had placed reliance upon the ratio enunciated in **Kanti Lal v. the State of Rajasthan and ors.**[1]

SUBMISSIONS MADE BY THE LEARNED COUNSEL APPEARING FOR THE NON-APPELLANTS :

8. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the non-appellant submitted that the present appeal is devoid of merit, as the appellants have

1D.B. SAW No. 1237/2026

not disputed the material facts concerning the reservation history of Gram Panchayat Barigha, its unchanged status since 1995, continuation of the existing cycle in 2020, or creation of new Gram Panchayats vide notification dated 20.11.2025. It was submitted that the learned Single Judge had duly considered Article 243-D of the Constitution, Section 16 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj Act, 1994, Rule 7 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj (Election) Rules, 1994, and the relevant circulars dated 08.12.2014, 10.08.2026, 16.08.2026 and 19.09.2026. The relief granted was limited to quashing the lottery insofar as it related to Gram Panchayat Barigha and directing a fresh draw under Rule 7 within seven days, without stalling the election process.

9. It was further submitted that Article 243-D(4) of the Constitution and Rule 7(12) of the Election Rules mandate rotation of reserved offices amongst different Panchayats. Since Gram Panchayat Barigha had already been reserved for the Scheduled Caste category in 1995 and 2015, its reservation again in 2026, without demonstrating that the existing roster had been exhausted, was contrary to the principle of rotation. The appellants had failed to establish that the Scheduled Caste roster for Panchayat Samiti had been exhausted after the 2015 and 2020 elections, which was a prerequisite for commencing a fresh cycle.

10. Learned counsel further submitted that the appellants' own circulars mandated continuation of the existing cycle. Clause 4(ii) of the circular dated 10.08.2026 stipulated that category-wise allocation in Panchayat Samitis that were reorganised or remained unchanged was to be made according to the existing cycle. The

subsequent order dated 16.08.2026 deleted the provision permitting a new cycle, while the clarification dated 19.09.2026 expressly clarified that the Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe roster was to be reckoned from 1994 and that a new roster could commence only after exhaustion of the existing one. Accordingly, Gram Panchayats already reserved were required to be excluded in favour of those remaining to be reserved.

11. It was contended that Panchayat Samiti Uchchain had been carved out of Rupbas in the year 2019, and even in the 2020 elections, the existing rotation had been continued. Since neither Gram Panchayat Barigha nor Panchayat Samiti Uchchain had been newly constituted in 2026, there was no justification for commencing a fresh cycle. The appellants had instead selected the six Gram Panchayats having the highest Scheduled Caste population, placing Barigha, with a Scheduled Caste population of 31.60%, at the sixth position. Such a population-based exercise, without first excluding Barigha from the roster, was contrary to Rule 7(12) and Clause 4(ii) of the circular dated 10.08.2026.

12. It was also submitted that, in terms of the circular dated 08.12.2014, newly created institutions were required to be included in the pool of institutions remaining to be reserved and ranked according to their Scheduled Caste/Scheduled Tribe population. Four Gram Panchayats, namely Kalyanpur, Daulatgarh, Jaicholi and Behrawali, had been newly created in Panchayat Samiti Uchchain vide notification dated 20.11.2025. These Gram Panchayats were therefore required to be included in the remaining pool, whereas Barigha, having already been reserved

twice, ought to have been excluded. The appellants had adopted a similar method in Panchayat Samiti Rupbas and Panchayat Samiti Bayana but had not addressed the notification dated 20.11.2025 in the present appeal.

13. With regard to the objection under Article 243-O of the Constitution, learned counsel submitted that the writ petition did not challenge any law relating to delimitation or allotment of seats but questioned an executive lottery conducted contrary to the statutory rules and circulars. It was further submitted that, when the writ petition was decided on 01.10.2026, the election programme had not been announced, as the State Election Commission announced the same only on 03.10.2026. Even thereafter, the election notification for Gram Panchayat Barigha had not been issued, and polling was scheduled for 16.11.2026. Consequently, the election process for Barigha had not commenced, and the bar under Article 243-O(b) was not attracted. In support of the said submission reliance was placed upon the ratio encapsulated in **Election Commission of India v. Ashok Kumar**[2], to submit that judicial intervention which facilitates and furthers the election process, without interrupting, obstructing or delaying it, is permissible. It was further submitted that the principles laid down in the said judgment, as well as the judgment **Union Territory of Ladakh and Ors. V. Jammu Kashmir National Conference, and anr.**[3]**,** supported corrective intervention where the authorities had acted contrary to law. The judgments relied upon by the appellants concerned interference

2(2000) 8 SCC 216
3(2024) 18 SCC 643

after commencement of the election process and did not establish that an illegal reservation, challenged before commencement of the election programme, must be allowed to stand.

14. Learned counsel submitted that no delay or disruption of the election process would result from the impugned judgment, as Gram Panchayat Barigha fell in the fourth phase of the elections, with polling scheduled for 16.11.2026, and its election notification had not yet been issued. It was further contended that the appellants had neither sought time to file a reply before the writ court nor disputed the material facts, and had placed no new document or fact on record in appeal. The plea of denial of opportunity was, therefore, an afterthought.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS :

15. Having considered the rival submissions advanced by learned counsel for the parties, examined the relevant constitutional and statutory provisions, and taken into consideration the nature of the relief granted by the learned Single Judge, this Court is of the considered opinion that the controversy in the present appeal must be examined not only in the context of the legality of the reservation exercise undertaken by the State authorities but also in the light of the constitutional scheme governing elections to Panchayati Raj Institutions and the limitations imposed upon judicial interference once the electoral process has commenced. It is undisputed that the delimitation exercise was challenged before this Court and a detailed order was passed in the case of **Sheela Kumari v. the State of Rajasthan[4],** and a timeline was fixed for

4D.B. Civil Writ Petition No. 7718/2025

holding the elections. The matter was carried to the Hon'ble Supreme Court, where the SLPs were dismissed, the State having given an undertaking to conclude the elections by 15.04.2026. Thereafter, the Division Bench in the ratio passed in **Girraj Singh Devendra v. the State of Rajasthan**[5], on application of State, extended the timeline to conclude the elections on or before 15.11.2026.

16. It is not in dispute that the State Election Commission published the election programme on 03.10.2026, which continues to remain in operation. The publication of the election programme marks a material stage in the electoral process and requires the authorities entrusted with the conduct of elections to proceed in accordance with the notified schedule, subject to the constitutional and statutory framework. The question, therefore, is whether the corrective directions issued by the learned Single Judge, though intended to address the grievance relating to reservation, could lawfully be sustained in the face of the constitutional restraint upon judicial interference in the ongoing election process.

17. At this juncture, it would be apposite to refer to Article 243-O of the Constitution of India, which provides a constitutional safeguard against judicial interference in electoral matters relating to Panchayats. The provision reads as under:

> *"**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 seals to such constituencies made or purporting to be made under article 243K, shall not be called in question in any court;*

5D.B. Civil Writ Petition (PIL) No. 1285/2025

(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."

18. A conjoint reading of the aforesaid clauses manifests the constitutional intent to ensure that the electoral process is not rendered vulnerable to repeated judicial challenges at its intermediate stages. The constitutional scheme envisages that electoral disputes be adjudicated through the mechanism prescribed by the State Legislature, thereby ensuring the timely completion of elections and the constitution of duly elected local self-government institutions. The aforesaid constitutional mandate has been reiterated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Sandeep Singh Bora v. Narendra Singh Deopa**[6], decided on 02.02.2026. The Hon'ble Supreme Court, while examining the limits of the High Court's jurisdiction under Article 226 in matters concerning Panchayat elections, emphasised that the constitutional embargo under Article 243-O must be respected and that an individual grievance cannot be permitted to derail or obstruct the electoral process where the governing State law provides an efficacious remedy by way of an election petition. The Court underscored that the right to contest an election and the remedies available in relation thereto must be exercised in accordance with the applicable statutory framework. The aforesaid pronouncement assumes significance in the present matter, inasmuch as the grievance raised by the respondent–writ petitioner pertains to the reservation of a particular Gram Panchayat for a particular category in the ensuing elections. The relief granted by the

---

62026 INSC 105

learned Single Judge, requiring the authorities to undertake a fresh reservation exercise, would necessarily entail reconsideration of the existing allocation and could have a consequential bearing upon the notified electoral arrangements. Once the election programme dated 03.10.2026 has been published and remains operative, such intervention must be tested against the constitutional requirement of uninterrupted progression of the election process.

19. This Court is conscious of the fact that Article 243-O does not obliterate the power of judicial review under Article 226 of the Constitution in every circumstance connected with an election. Nevertheless, the exercise of such jurisdiction is subject to the constitutional limitations governing electoral disputes and the nature and effect of the relief sought. The mere assertion that an administrative action is contrary to statutory rules or executive instructions cannot, by itself, justify an order that has the effect of reopening or altering an electoral arrangement after the election programme has been notified, particularly when the applicable law provides a prescribed mechanism for raising election-related grievances. The State Election Commission has declared election on 03.10.2026, for holding elections for 41 Zila Parishads having 1403 wards for 457 Panchayat Samitis having 8245 wards and 14403Village Panchayat having 1,30,589 wards with more than four crore voters. The election in case of first phase is held from 25.10.2026, and the second phase will be over on 31.10.2026, and from the next date the elections for the Upsarpanch would be held. Further, elections of third phase would also be over on

07.11.2026 and fourth phase will be over on 17.11.2026; thus, in such circuamstances where categorical byfurcation has been made and the same is even brought in public domain, the scope of judicial interference at such belated stage becomes more minuscule. The distinction between permissible judicial scrutiny and impermissible interference with an ongoing election was explained by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Election Commission of India v. Ashok Kumar[7], Lakshmi Charan Sen V. A.K.M. Hassan Uzzaman[8], N.P. Ponnuswami v. Returning Officer, Namkkal Constituency and Ors.[9] and Anuragh Narain Singh V. State of U.P.[10]**. The Hon'ble Supreme Court held that judicial intervention may be permissible where it facilitates and furthers the progress of an election without interrupting, obstructing or delaying the proceedings. Conversely, judicial intervention which impedes the electoral process or results in its postponement cannot ordinarily be justified merely on the ground that a party seeks correction of an alleged illegality. Applying the aforesaid principle to the facts of the present case, the direction to conduct a fresh lottery for reservation, after publication of the election programme dated 03.10.2026, cannot be viewed in isolation from its potential consequences upon the ongoing electoral exercise. Such a direction necessitates a fresh administrative exercise concerning the reservation of seats and may require consequential alterations to arrangements already made pursuant to the notified programme. The fact that the direction was confined to a

7(2000) 8 SCC 216
8(1985) 4 SCC 689
9(1952) 1 SCC 94
10(1996) 6 SCC 303

particular Gram Panchayat does not, by itself, remove the possibility of interference with the ongoing election process.

20. The submission advanced on behalf of the non-appellants that the impugned direction would not cause any delay, since the election notification for the concerned Gram Panchayat had not yet been issued and polling was scheduled for a subsequent phase, has also been considered. However, the relevant consideration is not confined to whether polling in the particular Gram Panchayat has commenced or whether its individual election notification has been issued. Once the State Election Commission has published the election programme on 03.10.2026, and the same remains in operation, the electoral process must be viewed as an integrated exercise comprising successive stages. The absence of an individual notification for a particular Gram Panchayat does not, by itself, confer an unrestricted licence to reopen the reservation exercise through judicial directions that may affect the notified electoral arrangements. The principle underlying the constitutional restriction is to prevent the electoral process from being interrupted through proceedings at successive stages and to ensure that disputes capable of being addressed through the prescribed electoral remedy are not permitted to impede the timely completion of elections.

21. The argument advanced by the non-appellants with regard to the alleged non-compliance with Rule 7 of the Rajasthan Panchayati Raj (Election) Rules, 1994, and the administrative circulars dated 08.12.2014, 10.08.2026, 16.08.2026 and 19.09.2026, raises a distinct question concerning the legality of

the reservation exercise and the application of the principle of rotation. The importance of reservation by rotation, as contemplated under Article 243-D of the Constitution and the applicable statutory rules, cannot be understated. However, the existence of an arguable grievance on the merits does not dispense with the requirement of examining whether the relief granted by the writ court was appropriate in the prevailing electoral circumstances. It is well settled that the constitutional scheme seeks to harmonise judicial review with the imperative of conducting elections in a timely and orderly manner. Consequently, even where a grievance concerning the reservation exercise is asserted to be substantial, the remedy must be pursued in a manner consistent with the applicable constitutional and statutory framework. The question of the legality of the reservation exercise cannot be treated as automatically overriding the constitutional restrictions applicable to election-related proceedings.

22. The Hon’ble Supreme Court, has time and again while examining disputes concerning local-body elections, delimitation and reservation, recognised the importance of adhering to the constitutional framework governing the conduct of elections and the need to avoid disruptions to the electoral process. In the present case, the learned Single Judge directed the authorities to undertake a fresh reservation exercise in accordance with Rule 7 of the Rules of 1994 and the applicable administrative circulars. Although the direction was intended to secure compliance with the governing legal framework, its effect must be assessed in the light

of the subsequent and material development that the election programme had been published on 03.10.2026 and continues to remain operative. In these circumstances, permitting the impugned direction to operate would risk reopening the reservation arrangements during the subsistence of the notified electoral programme and would not be consistent with the principle of electoral continuity embodied in Article 243-O of the Constitution.

23. This Court is, therefore, of the considered view that the dispute concerning the legality of the reservation allocation ought to be addressed in accordance with the remedy available under the applicable law, subject to the precise nature of the grievance and the statutory grounds available. The constitutional bar cannot be circumvented merely by framing the challenge as one concerning an administrative lottery when, in substance, the relief sought would alter the reservation arrangement governing the ensuing election. It is also noteworthy that the respondents have flatly placed reliance upon the ratio encapsulated in **Union Territory of Ladakh and Ors. (supra),** however, the same is not applicable to the matter at hand, as the same is on a distinguishable pedestal, as the said ratio pertains to issue of election symbol.

24. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court finds that the learned Single Judge, while directing a fresh reservation exercise, did not accord due weight to the constitutional limitations governing judicial interference in electoral matters; nevertheless, the impugned order has been passed on 01.10.2026 and the

election programme dated 03.10.2026 had been published subsequent to it, however, as on date the same remains in operation. The impugned judgment, to the extent that it directs a fresh reservation exercise, now during the subsistence of the notified electoral programme, cannot be sustained.

25. Accordingly, and in view of the subsequent development i.e. passing of the order dated 03.10.2026, the special appeals are **allowed,** in terms of the prayers made. The judgment and order dated 01.10.2026 passed by the learned Single Judge will not cause prejudice to the election process in question, as after passing of the said order, subsequent developments have taken place. The reservation lottery shall not be reopened pursuant to the directions contained in the impugned judgment/order during the subsistence of the election programme, in question.

26. It is clarified that this Court has not adjudicated upon the correctness of the reservation allocation on its substantive merits, and the observations made herein are confined to the question of judicial interference in view of the notified electoral programme. No opinion is expressed on any issue that may arise for consideration before the competent forum in proceedings maintainable under the applicable law.

27. Pending applications, if any, shall stand disposed.

28. A copy of the present order be separately placed in each connected files.

(SAMEER JAIN),J **(SANJAY K. AGRAWAL),CJ**

Preeti Asopa