



2026:AHC:58571-DB

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION (PIL) No. - 692 of 2026

Manohar And 6 Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of Uttar Pradesh And 6 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Pradeep Kumar Chaurasia
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C., Ten Singh

Court No. - 21

HON'BLE MAHESH CHANDRA TRIPATHI, J.
HON'BLE KUNAL RAVI SINGH, J.

1. Heard Shri Pradeep Kumar Chaurasia, learned counsel for the petitioner; Shri Rama Nand Pandey, learned Additional Chief Standing Counsel appearing for the State-respondents, and Shri Ten Singh, learned counsel appearing for respondent No. 2, State Election Commission, U.P., Lucknow.
2. By means of the instant petition, preferred as a Public Interest Litigation, the petitioner has sought, inter alia, the following reliefs:

"(i) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus commanding and directing Respondent No. 3/District Magistrate / District Election Officer (Panchayat), District Maharajganj, to restore the names of all genuine and eligible voters who have been illegally deleted from the Panchayat Election Voter List, 2025 of Gram Sabha Bairava Bankatwa, Block Laxmipur, District Maharajganj, after conducting proper verification in accordance with law.

(ii) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus, commanding and directing Respondent No. 3/District Magistrate / District Election Officer (Panchayat), District Maharajganj, to conduct a fair, impartial, and transparent inquiry into the illegal and arbitrary deletion of the names of approximately 500 voters from the Panchayat Election Voter List, 2025 of Gram Sabha Bairava Bankatwa, Block Laxmipur, District Maharajganj, and to take appropriate action in accordance with law against the persons found responsible.

(iii) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of Mandamus, commanding and directing Respondent No. 3/District Magistrate / District Election Officer (Panchayat), District Maharajganj, to consider

and decide the objection/representation submitted by the Petitioners and villagers within a stipulated time, and to verify the electoral roll and provisionally restore the names of all eligible voters whose names have been illegally deleted from the Panchayat Voter List, 2025 of Gram Sabha Bairava Bankatwa, Block Laxmipur, District Maharajganj, strictly in accordance with law.

(iv) Issue any other writ, order, or directions which this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the case.

(v) Award the cost of the petition to the Petitioners."

3. At the outset, Shri Rama Nand Pandey, learned counsel for the respondents, has raised an objection regarding the maintainability of the instant petition and submits that, while instituting the present petition, the petitioners have not strictly complied with sub-rule (3-A) of Rule 1 of Chapter XXII of the Allahabad High Court Rules, 1952, as amended in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *State of Uttaranchal vs. Balwant Singh Chaufal and others*, reported in 2010 AIR SCW 1029. In this backdrop, learned counsel for the respondents submits that the petitioners are not espousing the cause of the public at large. It is categorically averred in paragraph 19 of the writ petition that the names of several existing voters, including family members of the petitioners, have been deliberately removed from the voter list without issuing any notice, conducting any inquiry, or carrying out proper verification as required under law. He further submits that, instead of approaching the competent authority in light of the provisions contained under the Representation of People Act, 1950, the petitioners have preferred the present petition to espouse their own cause in the guise of a Public Interest Litigation.

4. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the reliefs sought, we are not inclined to entertain the instant petition, particularly in view of the exhaustive statutory procedure available in the matter. In case the incumbents are aggrieved by the exclusion or inclusion of their names in the voter list, an appropriate remedial forum is available under law. Instead of approaching the competent authority for redressal of their individual grievances, the instant Public Interest Litigation has been preferred by seven persons who, as per the averments made in paragraph 19 of the writ petition, are essentially espousing their own cause.

5. The instant petition, being devoid of merit, is accordingly **dismissed**.

However, it is left open to the petitioners that, in case they are individually aggrieved, they may avail the remedy as available under law.

March 20, 2026
Mukesh Kr.

(Kunal Ravi Singh,J.) (Mahesh Chandra Tripathi,J.)