

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

**WRIT PETITION NO. 7958 OF 2020**

Pravin Sheshrao Khedkar .. Petitioner

**Versus**

The State of Maharashtra and others .. Respondents

Shri Amol B. Chalak, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Shri P. S. Patil, Addl.G.P. for Respondents/State.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND  
SHRIKANT D. KULKARNI, JJ.**

**DATE : 03RD DECEMBER, 2020.**

**FINAL ORDER :**

. Mr. Chalak, the learned advocate for the petitioner submits that, the respondents have not adhered to the circular dated 29.11.2019 governing the ward formation. The learned counsel submits that, the circular dated 29.11.2019 mandates that the wards should be formed starting from South-West side. The respondents herein have commenced the ward formation from East side. The same is not permissible. The learned counsel further submits that, the petitioner had raised an objections on 13.02.2020 pointing out large scale violations in the ward formation. The respondents have failed to consider the objections. The objections have been ignored. Though detailed objections were raised, the respondents have not considered those objections in right perspective. Because of the wrong ward formation, the influential persons have got the delimitation of

the wards according to their interest.

2. We have also heard the learned Additional Government Pleader for respondents/State.

3. The objections, it appears that, raised by the petitioner were vague. We asked the learned advocate for the petitioner as to the number of voters/population for every ward, so also reservations made to the ward and whether they violate the rotation policy. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, the number of voters for every ward is almost same. The learned advocate also could not show as to how rotation policy is not adhered too. The Sub Divisional Officer, Pathardi has opined that, the topography of the road has been considered while considering ward Nos. 1, 2 and 3. It also does not appear that, the petitioner is prejudiced, at least no such case is substantiated according to the facts on record.

4. In the light of the above, no case for interference is made out. The writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

**[SHRIKANT D. KULKARNI, J.] [S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]**