

of the Panchayat. Therefore learned counsel submits that since the post of Sarpanch of aforesaid village was reserved for candidates from the women category, the resolution passed by the members of the Panchayat, thereby passing the no confidence motion by $\frac{2}{3}$ majority was not in accordance with mandate of aforesaid provisions and therefore the petition deserves consideration.

3. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned AGP appearing for the Respondent/State. On perusal of the order passed by the Additional Collector, Thane on 28th February 2019, it is crystal clear that the post of the Sarpanch of said village has been reserved for SC/ST category and not for women category. Admittedly, no confidence motion carried out against the petitioner was by two third ($\frac{2}{3}$) majority as required under Sub-section 3 of Section 35 of the Maharashtra Village Panchayat Act.

4. In that view of the matter, no case is made out to interfere the impugned order. Hence, writ petition stands rejected.

(S. S. SHINDE, J.)