

Neutral Citation No. - 2025:AHC:5205-DB

A.F.R.

**Reserved on 9.12.2024
Delivered on 10.01.2025**

Court No. - 3

Case :- WRIT - C No. - 33495 of 2024

Petitioner :- Vikash Kumar And Another

Respondent :- State Of Up And 3 Others

Counsel for Petitioner :- Mahendra Singh, Sr. Advocate

Counsel for Respondent :- Sanjeev Singh, C.S.C.

Hon'ble Anjani Kumar Mishra, J.

Hon'ble Jayant Banerji, J.

1. The writ petition, as initially framed, sought a writ of certiorari for quashing the order dated 21.08.2024 passed by the District Panchayat Raj Officer, District-Kushinagar, which is based on an inquiry report. Subsequently, by an amendment, an order passed by the District Magistrate/Collector, Kushinagar on 12.11.2024 has also been challenged. This order has been passed during the pendency of the instant writ petition.

2. The petition has been filed by two petitioners who claim to be elected members of Block Dudhahi, District-Kushinagar, having been elected in the election held in the year 2021. Respondent No. 4 was elected as Block Pramukh, Block Dudhahi. The strength of elected members of the Block Development Council is stated to be 139. Out of these, 101 members are stated to have moved a notice of no confidence in the prescribed pro-forma along with a notary affidavit on 12.08.2024. The notice of no confidence motion was moved before the Collector, as provided under Section 15(2) of the

U.P. Kshetra Panchayat and Zila Panchayat Adhiniyam, 1961¹.

3. When no order was passed by the Collector, a petition, being Writ-C No. 29128 of 2024, was filed before this Court whereupon on 03.09.2024, learned Standing Counsel was directed to obtain instructions. When the matter was taken up on 4.9.2024, a statement was made by the learned Standing Counsel, on the basis of instructions received, that the notice for no confidence motion has been rejected by an order dated 21.8.2024. The said writ petition was, therefore, dismissed as infructuous.

4. It appears that on receipt of certain affidavits by persons saying that their signatures on notice of no confidence were forged, a Committee was constituted by the Collector to look into the allegations.

5. The order of 21.08.2024, initially impugned in the writ petition, was an order passed consequent to the report of this Committee, which rejected the notice of no confidence on the ground that it was not maintainable as it was not in accordance with the relevant rules.

6. On the petition being filed, on 04.10.2024, a detailed order was passed noting the contention of the respective counsel for the parties and directing the Collector to file his personal affidavit.

7. A personal affidavit of the Collector was filed on the next date.

8. Subsequently, when the matter was taken up on 13.11.2024, the order dated 12.11.2024 passed by the Collector was produced by the learned Standing Counsel. It is this order which has been subjected to challenge by means of an amendment to the writ

¹ Act, 1961

petition.

9. It has been submitted by Shri Shashi Nandan, learned Senior Advocate appearing for the petitioners, that the order dated 21.08.2024 of District Panchayat Raj Officer, which is based upon a report of the Committee constituted by Collector, rejects the notice of no confidence on the ground that several signatures thereon were stated to be forged. The Inquiry Committee in its report dated 17.08.2024 found that there were affidavits of 48 members stating that they were shown as signatories to the notice of no confidence, fraudulently and by forging their signatures thereon. Consequently and since the signatures of less than half of the members of the Council were found to be genuine, the show-cause notice was rejected.

10. It is submitted that during the pendency of the writ petition, the Collector has passed the order dated 12.11.2024 which is on the same lines as the inquiry report and the order of the District Panchayat Raj Officer.

11. In the afore-noted factual background, Shri Shashi Nandan states that District Panchayat Raj Officer has no jurisdiction to pass the order dated 21.8.2024. Under the Act, 1961, it is only the Collector exercising powers under Section 15, who may pass such an order.

12. Insofar as the order passed by the Collector is concerned, he has submitted that under sub-section 3(i) of Section 15, a time frame has been provided. Under this provision, the Collector is required to convene a meeting for consideration of notice of no confidence which shall not be later than 30 days from the date the notice under sub-section (2) of Section 15 is delivered to him.

13. Section 15(3)(ii) of the Act, 1961 also provides for not less than 15 days notice being provided to the elected members prior to convening the meeting to consider the motion of no confidence.

14. It is next submitted that Section 15 only requires the Collector to examine as to whether the notice of no confidence has been signed by at least half of the total number of elected members of the Kshetra Panchayat. No further inquiry is required or mandated by law. Therefore, the direction of the Collector to constitute a committee to examine the notice of no confidence was without any sanction of law. Once at least half of the total number of elected members had appended their signatures on the notice of no confidence, the only option available to the Collector was to convene the meeting to consider the motion of no confidence. The issue raised through the motion of no confidence made to the Collector, therefore, would necessarily be required to be decided on the floor of the House and cannot be sought to be scuttled by an inquiry Committee constituted by the Collector considering the validity of the motion of no confidence in the manner done.

15. He has relied upon judgments in the cases of *Smt. Sheela Devi & Ors. v. State of U.P. & Ors.*² and *Niyazuddin & Ors. v. State of U.P. & Ors.*³.

16. Learned Standing Counsel supporting the impugned order has submitted that a valid notice to bring a motion of no confidence has to be signed by at least half of the elected members. The Collector received a complaint from 48 members who were alleged to be signatories of the notice of no confidence, stating that they had not put their signatures thereon. Hence, a Committee was constituted by

² 2015 (2) ADJ 325

³ 2020 (3) ADJ 398

the Collector to examine this aspect of the matter and in doing so, the Collector committed no illegality.

17. In support of his contentions, he has placed reliance upon the judgment of this Court in the case of **Narendra Kumar Gupta and 04 others**⁴. The judgment cited, placing reliance upon the Full Bench decision in **Smt. Sheela Devi**, has observed as follows:-

“From the afore-cited judgment, it clear emerges that the District Magistrate has to be at least prima facie satisfied that the notice of no confidence is a valid notice as per the requirements of Section 15(2) of the Act.”

18. It is therefore, submitted that it is for achieving this *prima facie* satisfaction and since there were complaints of forged signatures on the notice of no confidence, the Inquiry Committee was duly constituted. The same therefore, cannot be faulted with.

19. Shri Sanjeev Singh, who appears for the respondent No. 4, has submitted that the respondent No. 4 should be impleaded by name which has not been done. Since the Block Pramukh against whom the notice of no confidence was given is a necessary party and since she has not been impleaded properly, the writ petition must necessarily fail.

20. He has relied upon paragraph 23 of the judgment of the Apex Court in **Kavita v. State of U.P. and others**⁵ as also upon certain paragraphs of **Narendra Kumar Gupta** (supra).

21. We have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. The following questions arise for determination in the writ petition:-

(i) Whether the writ petition is liable to fail as the respondent

⁴ Writ-C No.11485 of 2024, decided on 10.7.2024

⁵ AIR 2018 SC 4143

No. 4, the Block Pramukh, against whom, the notice of no confidence has been moved, having not been impleaded by name?

(ii) Whether the Collector was competent to order a fact finding inquiry to go into the question of alleged forgery of signatures on the notice of no confidence?

(iii) Whether the District Panchayat Raj Officer had any jurisdiction to pass the order dated 21.08.2024?

(iv) Whether the order dated 12.11.2024 passed by the Collector is valid?

(v) Relief, if any, to which the petitioner is entitled?

22. As regards the first question, it is the contention of learned counsel for the respondent No. 4 that the said respondent has not been impleaded by name, therefore, the petition has to fail. In our considered opinion, this submission is liable to be rejected. The purpose of impleadment of a person is only for a notice being sent to the person to provide an opportunity of hearing. The respondent No. 4 has already put in appearance and her counsel has been heard. Therefore, if she has not been impleaded by name, yet she has been afforded opportunity of hearing, the submission lacks substance. In any case, improper imleadment is a curable defect and can never be fatal for a writ petition. **The first question is answered accordingly.**

23. The reply to the second question framed, as to whether Collector was competent to order a fact finding inquiry by a Committee of three persons, is to be found in paragraph 6 of the judgment of Supreme Court in the case of *Kavita* and which referring to a Full Bench of this Court in *Smt. Sheela Devi*, held as follows:-

“6. As aforesaid, since the stated notice has already been acted

upon and the no confidence motion has been passed against the appellant by majority, no further enquiry into the grounds urged by the appellant is warranted. Be that as it may, even the first ground urged by the appellant has been justly negated by the High Court following the exposition of the Full Bench of the same High Court in *Smt. Sheela Devi v. State of U.P. and Ors.*, MANU/UP/0129/2015 : AIR 2015 which decision adverts to the dictum of another Full Bench decision of the same High Court in **Mathura Prasad Tewari Vs. Assistant District Panchayat Officer, Faizabad** 1966 ALJ 612. In the impugned judgment, the Division Bench has reproduced paragraph 23 of the Full Bench decision in *Sheela Devi*, (supra) which reads thus:

“23. For these reasons, we have come to the conclusion that where a notice is delivered to the Collector under sub-section (2) of Section 15, the Collector has the discretion to determine whether the notice fulfills the essential requirements of a valid notice under sub-section (2). However, consistent with the stipulation of time enunciated in sub-section (3) of Section 15 of convening a meeting no later than thirty days from the date of delivery of the notice and of issuing at least a fifteen days' notice to all the elected members of the Kshetra Panchayat, it is not open to the Collector to launch a detailed evidentiary enquiry into the validity of the signatures which are appended to the notice. Where a finding in regard to the validity of the signatures can only be arrived at in an enquiry on the basis of evidence adduced in the course of an evidentiary hearing at a full-fledged trial, such an enquiry would be outside the purview of Section 15. The Collector does not exercise the powers of a Court upon receipt of a notice and when he transmits the notice for consideration at a meeting of the elected members of the Kshetra Panchayat. Hence, it would not be open to the Collector to resolve or enter findings of fact on seriously disputed questions such as forgery, fraud and coercion. However, consistent with the law which has been laid down by the Full Bench in Mathura Prasad Tewari's case, it is open to the Collector, having due regard to the nature and ambit of his jurisdiction under sub-section (3) to determine as to whether the requirements of a valid notice under sub-section (2) of Section 15 have been fulfilled. The proceeding before the Collector under sub-section (2) of Section 15 of the Act of 1961 is more in the nature of a summary proceeding. The Collector for the purpose of Section 15, does not have the trappings of a Court

exercising jurisdiction on the basis of evidence adduced at a trial of a judicial proceeding. Whether in a given case, the Collector has transgressed the limits of his own jurisdiction is a matter which can be addressed in a challenge under Article 226 of the Constitution. We clarify that we have not provided an exhaustive enumeration or list of circumstances in which the Collector can determine the validity of the notice furnished under sub-section (2) in each case and it is for the Collector in the first instance and for the Court in the exercise of its power of judicial review, if it is moved, to determine as to whether the limits on the power of the Collector have been duly observed.”

24. It is pertinent to mention here that in the case of **Smt. Sheela Devi**, the Full Bench of this Court referred to and approved the observations made by a Division Bench of this Court in **Utma Devi vs. State of U.P. & Ors.**⁶. The Full Bench has observed as follows:-

“19. In that case, of the 82 elected members of the Kshetra Panchayat, a notice of no confidence was presented with the signatures of forty nine members. Thirty six appeared before the District Magistrate and their signatures/thumbs impressions were verified. Nineteen persons had filed affidavits supporting the motion but subsequently respondent no 5 therein filed affidavits of the same persons denying their earlier signatures. Accordingly, a notice was issued to those members to appear before the District Magistrate, of whom seven appeared and supported their affidavits filed in support of the motion of no confidence. The District Magistrate held that since the remaining ten members who had filed their affidavits in support of the motion for no confidence did not appear and notice on two members could not be served, the motion was not supported by the required number of half of the elected representatives. Holding that this was an improper exercise of jurisdiction, the Division Bench observed as follows:

“There cannot be a presumption about the signatures being forged or not being that of the members. Contention raised on behalf of the petitioner appears to be correct. Under the Act, 1961 and the Rules prescribed, there is no requirement of any actual physical presence of the members before the District Magistrate in support of the motion. What is only required is that the motion should be signed by more than half of the members, and if there are affidavits on record in support of the motion and further if there are affidavits to the contrary submitted by the Block Pramukh, it is the duty of the District Magistrate to

⁶ 2014 (4) ADJ 3

satisfy himself from the records of the Kshetra Panchayat as to whether prima facie the motion bears the signatures of members or not. He is not required to act as the Civil Court and enter into the necessities of evidence for coming to the conclusion that the signatures on the motion are genuine or not."

Here again, the Division Bench has clearly laid down that the District Magistrate is not required to act as a civil court and to enquire into matters of evidence for coming to the conclusion as to whether the signatures on the motion are genuine or otherwise."

(emphasis supplied)

25. It is pertinent to refer to some of the provisions of Section 15 of the Act, 1961, which are as follows:-

"15 Motion of non-confidence in Pramukh -

(1) A motion expressing want of confidence in the Pramukh or any of a Kshetra Panchayat may be made and proceeded with in accordance with the procedure laid down in the following sub-sections.

(2) A written notice of intention to make the motion in such form as may be prescribed, signed by at least half of the total number of elected members of the Kshetra Panchayat for the time being together with a copy of the proposed motion, shall be delivered in person, by any one of the members signing the notice, to the Collector having jurisdiction over the Kshetra Panchayat.

(3) The Collector shall thereupon:-

- (i) convene a meeting of the Kshetra Panchayat for the consideration of the motion at the office of the Kshetra Panchayat on a date appointed by him, which shall not be later than thirty days from the date on which the notice under sub-section (2) was delivered to him; and
- (ii) give to the elected member of the Kshetra Panchayat notice of not less than fifteen days of such meeting in such manner as may be prescribed.

Explanation – In computing the period of thirty days specified in this sub-section, the period during which a stay order, if any, issued by a Competent Court on a petition filed against the motion made under this section is in force plus such further time as may be required in the issue of fresh notices of the meeting to the members shall be excluded."

26. It is evident from perusal of the provisions of Section 15, as quoted above, that an onerous responsibility is on the Collector for

compliance of the provisions to the letter. Under sub-section (5) of Section 2 of the Act, 1961, the term 'Collector' includes an Additional Collector to whom the Collector may have, by order in writing, delegated any of his function under the Act, 1961. The Legislature, in its wisdom, has confined the power of delegation by the Collector to the Additional Collector alone. That is to say, other than the Collector, it is only the Additional Collector to whom any of the functions of the Collector under the Act can be delegated by order in writing. The provision does not envisage delegating or sub-delegating of the power of the Collector to a Committee for satisfying himself regarding genuineness of the signatures of the members signing the notice. As observed by this Court in ***Utma Devi*** and affirmed in the case of ***Smt. Sheela Devi***, where there are affidavits on record in support of the motion and further if there are affidavits to the contrary submitted, it is the duty of the Collector to satisfy himself from the record of the Kshetra Panchayat as to whether, *prima facie*, the motion bears the signatures of members or not. He is not required to act as a civil court and enter into the niceties of evidence for coming to a conclusion that the signatures on the motion of no confidence are genuine or not.

27. What we find from the record is that a scrutiny report (परीक्षण आख्या) dated 17.8.2024 was prepared by a three members Inquiry Committee consisting of the Assistant Development Officer (Panchayat), the Block Development Officer and the District Panchayat Raj Officer pursuant to an office order dated 16.8.2024 passed by the Chief Development Officer. The scrutiny report is to the effect that on 12.8.2024, some members of Kshetra Panchayat Dudhahi alongwith 101 members of the Kshetra Panchayat submitted a notarized affidavit before the Chief Development

Officer/Incharge Collector for purpose of moving a no confidence motion against Smt. Ramawati Devi, Pramukh, Kshetra Panchayat Dudhahi, District Kushinagar with a demand for fixing a date in that regard. That on 16.8.2024, the applicant, Deepak Kumar Mishra, and other members submitted a complaint to the Collector, Kushinagar to the effect that on the basis of fraudulent documents, a no confidence motion is being brought against the Block Pramukh. For inquiry into the matter and for verification of documents, the Chief Development Officer constituted a three members Verification/Inquiry Committee by an order dated 6.8.2024 under the Chairmanship of the District Panchayat Raj Officer, the members of which Committee were those aforesaid.

28. In the inquiry report, it was stated that the total elected members of Kshetra Panchayat Dudhahi is 139, of which one member has died and, therefore, at present 138 members are there; that 48 members presented themselves before the Committee and their identity cards were scrutinized and verified; that the Block Development Officer and the Assistant Development Officer (Panchayat), Dudhahi identified all those 48 members of the Kshetra Panchayat and they were found to be correct; that all those members submitted affidavits to the Block Development Officer, Dudhahi to the effect that prior to that they had not submitted any affidavits and if any person has submitted affidavits with signatures of the members, the same should be considered as forged and fabricated; that additionally, the verification/inquiry Committee got the entire procedure video recorded in which all the members present there stated that they had never signed any letter relating to no confidence and in that no confidence motion, their fabricated signatures have been made; that the aforesaid 48 Kshetra Panchayat

members' list was compared to the list of 101 Kshetra Panchayat members enclosed alongwith the no confidence motion filed on 12.8.2024; that the names of all the 48 members were found in the no confidence motion enclosed in the list of members of the Kshetra Panchayat; and that since these 48 Kshetra Panchayat members have denied their signatures on the no confidence motion against the Pramukh of the Kshetra Panchayat Dudhahi, therefore, only the resultant number of 53 members who support the motion for no confidence filed on 12.8.2024, remain.

29. It is further mentioned in the inquiry report that under the provisions of Section 15(2) of the Act, 1961, a minimum of half of the total number of the elected members of the Kshetra Panchayat are mandated to sign the written notice and the total number of the elected members of the Kshetra Panchayat Dudhai is 139 and, therefore, the half of the members would be 70 in number, who necessarily had to sign the no confidence motion; that on the confidence motion, only 53 members have been found to have signed which is less than 50% of the specified number. It is further stated that as per Rule 1 of the Rules with regard to moving a no confidence motion against the Pramukh and Up-Pramukh, the proposal means a written notice in Form-1 of the Schedule thereof; that the no confidence motion filed on 12.8.2024 is not in accordance with the prescribed format and, therefore, the no confidence motion is not maintainable.

30. On 21.8.2024, an order was passed by the District Panchayat Raj Officer that the application dated 12.8.2024 regarding the no confidence motion is rejected.

31. As regards the notice not being in the proper format, a

coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of **Arti vs. State of U.P.**⁷ has held that though the relevant rules provide for a particular format, however, if in the written notice, intention to make a motion for no confidence is reflected from perusal of the notice, it would be sufficient notice of intention to make the motion and as such it is not mandatory for the motion to be in the prescribed format. The relevant observations are as follows:

“18. The object of giving a written notice of the intention to make the motion of no confidence is to make possible for the Collector to ascertain as to whether the motion is backed by at least half of the elected members or not. The said requirement is of a mandatory character. If the written notice of intention to make the motion is not signed by at least half of the total number of the elected members, the Collector would not get jurisdiction to take cognizance of the same, nor to issue notice under subsection (3) of section 15. However, at the same time, even if notice of the intention to make the motion is not given in the prescribed format but it contains all the ingredients of Form-I, it is always open to the Collector to cull out the intention of the members giving the notice and to act upon it. The object of prescribing Form-I is only of a procedural nature to enable the Collector to understand its import and to act without delay. Where a written notice of intention to make the motion is given in prescribed format, it becomes easy for the Collector to decipher intention of those giving the notice and to act accordingly. The copy of the written notice of intention to make the motion is thus for the convenience of the Collector. A person giving notice to the Collector which is not in prescribed format is always at the risk of Collector not taking due cognizance of the same. However, in a case where the Collector acts on a notice of intention to bring forth motion of no-confidence, though not contained in prescribed format, the person against whom the motion is brought cannot complain of the same. He is in no manner prejudiced thereby as the notice is not meant for him but for the Collector. Even its copy is not required to be sent to the members or the person against whom the motion is brought. Only the copy of the proposed no confidence motion is to be annexed alongwith the notice of the Collector.”

32. As far as the denial of signatures by 48 members, as stated in the inquiry report, is concerned, it is for the Collector personally to verify the signatures appearing in the written notice of intention to

⁷ 2017 (7) ADJ 30 (DB)

make a motion of non-confidence with the records of the Kshetra Panchayat as to whether, *prima facie*, the motion bears the signatures of members or not.

33. Insofar as the jurisdiction of District Panchayat Raj Officer to reject a no confidence motion is concerned, under Section 15 of the Act, 1961, it is the Collector to whom a notice of no confidence is to be delivered in person by any one of the persons signing the notice. It is for the Collector, thereafter, to either reject the same lawfully, or to call a meeting for consideration of the no confidence motion after giving at least 15 days notice to the members to participate in such meeting. When under the provisions of section 15, jurisdiction is vested in the Collector to convene a meeting and take other steps, it is the Collector himself who is responsible to undertake the exercise of recording his *prima facie* satisfaction as to the validity of the notice and pass appropriate order thereon. Any power conferred by the Act, 1961 cannot be delegated by the Collector to any person, other than the authority to whom delegation is permitted. The involvement of District Panchayat Raj Officer in this process is absolutely alien to the relevant provisions under Section 15 of the Act, 1961. The District Panchayat Raj Officer has no role to play and has no jurisdiction to either reject or to accept a notice of a motion of no confidence. The order of the District Panchayat Raj Officer dated 21.08.2024 is, therefore, wholly and completely without jurisdiction. **The question nos.2 and 3 are answered accordingly.**

34. Insofar as the fourth question framed by the Court is concerned, given the mandate of Section 15 of the Act, 1961, in our considered opinion, the Collector is mandated to pass such an order promptly. The legislature was conscious of the fact that in matters relating to no confidence motion being moved and the same being

put before a House for vote in due course, time is the essence. The elements of coercion and offers to members of the House to sway the votes cannot be ruled out. The Collector is expected, therefore, to act with alacrity, which has not been done in the instant case. We find that in his order dated 12.11.2024, the Collector has merely relied upon the inquiry report dated 17.8.2024, which is illegal and deserves to be set aside.

35. There is another aspect of the matter. The Collector took no steps whatsoever to consider the motion for non-confidence as to whether the application was in order. He stood on the sidelines, thereby abdicating his responsibility and his solemn obligation under the Act, 1961. Either the Collector does not understand his duties under the Act or he has willful permitted an illegality to happen. No one can be permitted to deviate from a solemn obligation imposed on him by statute.

36. It is pertinent to mention here that even when the personal affidavit of the Collector was filed in Court on 21.10.2024, he sought to justify his actions or rather his inaction. When the matter was next listed on 4.11.2024, certain oral observations were made by the Court regarding the conduct of the Collector. It was then that the Collector passed the order on 12.11.2024 and that too solely on the basis of a so-called report of the Chief Development Officer dated 20.8.2024 (Annexure PA-5 to the personal affidavit) which report merely affirms the aforesaid scrutiny/inquiry report dated 17.8.2024. The order of 12.11.2024 has been passed hurriedly, as a 'knee jerk' reaction to the oral observations of the Court on 4.11.2024 and is an afterthought and an attempt by the Collector to 'cover his tracks' which is nothing but a masquerade. It has been passed after nearly 3 months of the delivery of the motion of no confidence on 12.8.2024

and that too without considering the mandate of this Court in ***Utma Devi***. No independent application of mind is reflected in the order dated 12.11.2024. Therefore, the order is illegal and invalid. We find that the Collector has acted contrary to the statute. Accordingly, **the fourth question framed by this Court is answered in the negative.**

37. Under the facts and circumstances of this case, the impugned orders dated 21.08.2024 and 12.11.2024 are quashed. The inquiry report dated 17.8.2024 was made by a Committee constituted contrary to the letter and spirit of the Act, 1961 and, therefore, it is also set aside.

38. Since the actions of the Collector concerned in constituting the Committee to conduct an inquiry and permitting the District Panchayat Raj Officer to pass the impugned order dated 21.8.2024 has been held to be an abdication of statutory responsibility by the concerned Collector leading to provisions of the Act, 1961 being sought to be rendered nugatory, we partly **allow** the writ petition with cost of Rs.50,000/- that shall be paid by the State Government to the petitioners within a month from today. It shall be open to the State Government to recover the amount of cost from the concerned authority/Collector.

39. The District Magistrate/Collector is directed to personally undertake the exercise of satisfying himself as to the validity of the notice in terms of the judgment in ***Utma Devi*** as affirmed by a Full Bench of this Court in ***Smt. Sheela Devi***, the extract of the judgment whereof is quoted in paragraph no. 24 above. If the District Magistrate is, *prima facie*, satisfied as to the signatures of the members of the Kshetra Panchayat in the written notice of intention

to make the no confidence motion after looking into the records of the Kshetra Panchayat, he shall proceed to convene a meeting of Kshetra Panchayat for consideration of 'no confidence motion' at the office of Kshetra Panchayat on a date appointed by him, within a period of thirty days from today and shall give to the elected members of Kshetra Panchayat notice of not less than fifteen days of such meeting in the manner prescribed.

Order Date :-10.01.2025
Aditya Tripathi/SK