

***IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION***

WRIT PETITION NO.9796 OF 2017

Anita Anant Patil .. Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

***ALONG WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.9792 OF 2017***

Baban Rama Hirave .. Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

***ALONG WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.9793 OF 2017***

Lata Sitaram Jadhav .. Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

***ALONG WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.9794 OF 2017***

Ram Navshya Waghmare .. Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

***ALONG WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.9795 OF 2017***

Rajeshri Yashwant Malbari .. Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr.Sanghraj D. Rupwate i/by Mr.Aniket B. Deshkar for the petitioners
in all petitions.

Mr.S.D. Rayrikar, AGP for the respondent nos.1 to 3-State.

Mr.V.S.Tadake for the respondent no.4.

CORAM : R.D. DHANUKA, J.**DATE : 2nd May 2018****P.C.:**

. By these petitions filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, each of the petitioners has impugned the order dated 4th August 2017 passed by the respondent no.2 thereby rejecting the revision application filed by the petitioners. Each of the petitioners was disqualified on the ground that each of them had not filed election expenses within the time prescribed under Section 14B (a) of the Maharashtra Village Panchayats Act.

2. The dispute application filed by the respondent no.4 against each of these petitioners was allowed by the Additional Collector, Raigad Alibag. The Revision Application filed by these petitioners came to be rejected by the learned Additional Commissioner, Kokan Division, Mumbai. None of these petitioners could produce any proof for filing of election expenses under the said provision.

3. It is the case of the petitioners that each of the petitioners had filed and submitted election expenses along with the documents withing one month from the date of election however no acknowledgement has been given by the concerned authorities to the petitioners. It is not the case of the petitioners that the petitioners after filing the accounts of election expenses had placed on record that though the accounts of the election expenses had filed, no acknowledgement had been given by the election authorities. It is not possible to accept the contention of the petitioners that the concerned authorities did not give

election expenses though the acknowledgement of the same was filed by the petitioners within the time prescribed under Section 14B (a) of the Maharashtra Village Panchayats Act.

4. Both the authorities have rendered findings which are not perverse and cannot be interfered with under Article 227 of the Constitution of India by this Court.

5. All the petitions are devoid of merits and are accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

R.D. DHANUKA, J.