



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

910 WRIT PETITION NO. 3590 OF 2024

LATABAI NAMDEO NAGVE
VERSUS
THE ADDITIONAL DIVISIONAL COMMISSIONER I AND
OTHERS

...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Kulkarni Vaibhav B.
AGP for Respondents-State : Mr. P. D. Patil.

...

CORAM : S. G. MEHARE, J.
DATE : 04.04.2024

PER COURT :-

1. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. Issue notice to the respondents.
3. Learned AGP waives service of notice for respondent Nos.1 and 2-State.
4. The petitioner was the elected member of village panchayat. Her son runs a company. It has been alleged against her son that her son has done the computer repairing work. Therefore, she has indirectly the share and interest in the work done by her son. Therefore, she has disqualified under Section 14(1)(g) of the Maharashtra Village Panchayats Act.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that there were no work orders. The work was done by the company run by her son. She has no concern with his company. She was never the partner or shareholder in the company run by her son. She did not receive the share or had interest in the work done by her son. However, the Authorities below did not consider this fact and erroneously passed the impugned orders.

6. Learned AGP seeks time to take the instructions.

7. Considering the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner, there appears ground to consider the prayer for interim protection. It is a matter of investigation and it will take time. Therefore, there shall be an interim stay to the impugned judgments and orders till the next date.

8. Stand over to 19.04.2024.

9. In addition to the regular mode of the service of notice, the petitioner may serve the respondents privately.

10. *Hamdast* allowed.

(S. G. MEHARE, J.)

...