

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 6454 OF 2016

Aruna Shrimant Dahire

.. Petitioner

vs

The Additional Collector,
Ambajogai and others .

.. Respondents

--

Mr. Sudarshan J. Salunke, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. S. K. Tambe, Asstt.Govt.Pleader for respondents no.1 and
2

Mr. R. D. Khadap, advocate h/f Mr. S.S. Thombre, advocate for
respondents no. 4 to 11

CORAM : SUNIL P. DESHMUKH, J.

DATE : 22nd June, 2016

ORDER :

1. Heard learned counsel for the appearing parties.
2. Petitioner-original applicant is before this court, purportedly aggrieved by judgment and order dated 25-04-2016 passed by Additional Collector, Ambajogai, in dispute bearing no.2016/VP/Appeal/03 preferred by present petitioner challenging no confidence motion passed against her in meeting held on 20-02-2016, wherein eight out of nine members have voted in favour no confidence motion.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that gram panchahayat members had been entertaining grudge against present petitioner who had been working as Sarpanch since 2012 and that she is the victim of political rivalry.

4. Learned counsel for respondents no. 4 to 11, however, submits that no confidence motion had been moved levelling various charges as have been referred to in the requisition and that those had been duly discussed in the meeting and the motion of no confidence has been passed by majority of 8 against 1 vote.

5. Perusal of the impugned order shows that all the relevant aspects have been considered and compliance of requisite procedure has been verified by the Additional Collector and he found that there is no infirmity of any nature as had been sought to be alleged in the course of hearing and whatever allegations had been made by petitioner had not been supported by any credible material.

6. In the circumstances, while the majority has lost confidence in the petitioner, there is no point in favour of the petitioner in seeking forcible continuation and thrusting her on gram pancnahayat.

7. In view of aforesaid, writ petition does not appear to carry any substance.

8. Writ petition, as such, is not being entertained and is rejected.

SUNIL P. DESHMUKH,
JUDGE

pnd