

pdp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 13645 OF 2016

Mr. Kishor Dnyaneshwar Karpe

.. Petitioner

Vs.

State Election Commission, Maharashtra
and anr.

.. Respondents

Mr. S. S. Redij for petitioner.

Mr. S. B. Shetye for respondent no.1.

Mrs. M. P. Thakur, AGP for State.

Mr. A. P. Kulkarni for Corporation-added respondent.

CORAM: NARESH H. PATIL &
M. S. KARNIK, JJ.

JANUARY 10, 2017.

P.C.

1. Leave to add Pune Municipal Corporation as party respondent.

2. Petitioner admittedly did not file any objection to the draft Ward formation for Pune Corporation election. Some other persons filed objections. The respondents published final Ward formation plan. The petitioner is aggrieved by the changes brought in the final Ward formation. It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that in the draft Ward formation Vidhate Vasti was shown in Ward No. 9, but in the final

Ward formation plan the respondents had shifted part of the said Vidhate Vasti in Ward No. 8. The guidelines issued by the Election Commission were not followed. It is alleged that the procedure established in connection with the said exercise was also not followed.

3. Respondent No.1 filed an affidavit and explained the circumstances in which the objections filed to the draft Ward formation was dealt with and the final Ward formation was done.

4. We have heard the learned counsel Mr. Shetye for respondent no.1. Learned counsel submitted that in accordance with the geographical boundaries the last preceding census figure published in the year 2011, the State Election Commission has formed its opinion, called for objection and thereafter published the final Ward formation plan.

5. We have perused the record, affidavit filed by respondent no.1 and considered the submissions advanced. In exercise of our writ jurisdiction, we are not inclined to interfere in the matter.

6. Petition is dismissed.

(M. S. KARNIK, J.)

(NARESH H. PATIL,J.)