

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO. 482 OF 2016

SHRI. TILU ZIRU NAIK.

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF GOA, BY ITS CHIEF
SECRETARY AND 4 ORS.,

... Respondents

Mr. Mahesh Amonkar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. S.D. Lotlikar, Advocate General with Mr. Deep Shirodkar,
Additional Government Advocate for Respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

Ms. Asha Dessai, Advocate for Respondent No. 4.

Mr. Purushottam R. Karpe, Advocate for Respondent No. 5.

Coram:- SMT. R. P. SONDURBALDOTA &
C. V. BHADANG, JJ.

Date:- 30th November, 2016

P.C:

The grievance raised by the petitioner in this petition is essentially of failure on the part of respondent no. 2 in taking action for demolition of the construction alleged to be illegal, within the stipulated time limit as prescribed under sub-section 3 of Section 66 of the Goa Panchayat Raj Act, 1994. Mr. Shirodkar states that in view of the failure on the part of respondent no. 2, the Deputy Director of Panchayats, South Goa, Margao has assumed the powers of respondent no. 4 in terms of Section 66(5) vide order dated 12.08.2016 and issued notice dated 12.08.2016 to respondent no. 5 under Section 66(5)(3) and (4) of the Goa Panchayat Raj Act. He produces copy of the notice for perusal of the Court. In view of the notice, the grievance of the petitioner as regards failure in taking action in respect of the illegal construction stands redressed.

2. However, considering the length of time taken for taking the action, in our opinion, the petition can be disposed of with a direction to the Deputy Director of Panchayats, South Goa, Margao to dispose of the proceedings before him within a period of four months from today.

C. V. BHADANG, J.

SMT. R. P. SONDURBALDOTA, J.

EV