

(1)

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 203 OF 2019

Gangabai Laxman Jadhav,
Age Major, Occu.Grampanchayat Member,
R/o Tondchir, Ta.Udgir,
Dist. Latur.

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra
Through its Secretary,
Rural Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai.
2. The District Collector, Latur,
Collector Office, Latur
3. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Udgir
Sub-Divisional Officer, Udgir
Dist. Latur
4. The Tahasildar, Udgir
Tahasil Office, Udgir
Dist. Latur
5. The Divisional Caste Certificate Scrutiny
Committee, Latur Division, Latur,
Through its Commissioner.

..RESPONDENTS

Mr D. S. Kudle, Advocate for petitioner;
Mr V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for respondent/State

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE
AND
S. M. GAVHANE, JJ.**

DATE : 5th FEBRUARY, 2019

ORAL ORDER:

Heard learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner.

(2)

2. Learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted before us that though the petitioner challenges the notice dated 13th December, 2018 and prays for directions to decide the pending proposal submitted by the petitioner to respondent No.5 - Committee, the petitioner is not pressing prayer clause (B), which is in respect of notice dated 13th December, 2018. The petitioner is only seeking limited relief in terms of prayer clause (C) directions.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that the claim of the petitioner was forwarded to respondent No. 5 - Committee for validation, as the petitioner contested election for Grampanchayat Tondchir, Taluka Udgir, District Latur and same is pending before the Committee.

4. It reveals from the record that the copy of the petition was supplied to the office of Government Pleader on 4th January, 2019. The office of Government Pleader sought for instructions from respondent No. 5 - Committee. In response to the communication forwarded from the office of Government Pleader, learned A.G.P. was informed from respondent No. 5 - Committee that though claim of the petitioner was submitted to the Committee for validation, as there were certain deficiencies in the claim itself, said claim was returned to respondent No. 4 - Tahsildar, Udgir.

5. We see no reason not to accept the statement of learned A.G.P.

(3)

6. In view of these facts, learned Counsel for the petitioner submits before us that the petitioner be permitted to submit his claim before respondent No. 5 - Committee afresh and the Committee be directed to decide the claim within stipulated period.

7. This being a very limited prayer and no prejudice would cause to the respondents - authorities and more particularly, respondent No. 5. If the petitioner submits the claim for validation before respondent No. 5 - The Divisional Caste Certificate Scrutiny Committee, Latur Division, Latur within two weeks from today, the said Committee to decide the claim within sixteen (16) weeks, needless to state, on merits of the claim and in view of relevant provisions of law as well as relevant resolutions, circulars, judicial decisions etc.

8. With these directions, the petition is disposed of.

(S. M. GAVHANE, J.)

(PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.)