



Pradnya

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 6568 OF 2007
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 813 OF 2008
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1212 OF 2008
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 6568 OF 2007

Mukhtar Rajjak Khatik

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and ors.

...Respondents

Ms Shagufta Patel, i/b. Mr Harshad Bhadbhade, *for Petitioner.*
Mr Vikas M. Mali, AGP, *for Respondent Nos.1, 2, 3 and 5-State.*

CORAM M.S. Sonak &
 Kamal Khata, JJ.
DATED: 27 September 2024

PC:-

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. The main challenge in this Petition was to the virus of Section 9A of the Municipal Council Act, 1965. By a detailed

judgment and order dated 20 December 2007 made in a batch of the Petitions including the present Petition, the constitutional validity of this provision is already upheld.

3. Besides, learned counsel for Respondent Nos.1 to 3 and 5 points out that the Petitioner's claim was examined by the Caste Scrutiny Committee and the same was not found to be valid.

4. Further, we are informed that there are decisions of the Full Bench and the Hon'ble Supreme Court governing the issue. In any event, this was the matter relating to elections that were held in 2006.

5. For all the above reasons, nothing survives in this Writ Petition and the same is therefore disposed of. There shall be no order for costs.

6. Civil Applications do not survive and are disposed of.

(Kamal Khata, J)

(M.S. Sonak, J)