



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR**

**WRIT PETITION NO.3212 OF 2024**

Sau. Sushma Bharat Thorat Vs. Additional Commissioner, Amravati and ors.

---

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of  
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders  
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

---

Shri N.A. Gawande, Advocate for the Petitioner/s

Shri Harshal Futane, AGP for the Respondent Nos.1 and 2/State

**CORAM : URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.**

**DATED : 21/05/2024.**

**1** Heard.

**2** By this writ petition, the petitioners have challenged the communication dated 16.05.2024 issued by the respondent No.2/Collector, Amravati, to hold the elections for the vacant post of Surpanch of Grampanchayat at Kandli, Tq. Achalpur, Dist. Amravati.

**3** The elections for the post of the membership of the respondent No.3/village panchayat, were held on 15.01.2021 in which the petitioner No.2 and the respondent Nos.4 to 18 participated and got elected on the post of the membership and thereafter the respondent No.4-Savita Dashrath Aahake and respondent No.5-Dilip @ Ganga Nimichand Dhandare were duly elected on the post of Sarpanch and Upsarpanch of village panchayat, respectively.

4 While holding the post of Sarpanch and Upsarpanch, the respondent Nos.4 and 5 allegedly acted against the interest of the villagers and the village panchayat and they allegedly misused their post by committing the financial irregularities and run affairs of village panchayat for personal gain.

5 Therefore, the petitioner No.1 moved representation before the various authorities. In view of the complaint filed by the petitioner No.1, a direction was issued to the Assistant Block Development Officer to conduct an inquiry into the matter and submit the report and accordingly, the Assistant Block Development Officer conducted the detail inquiry after giving due hearing opportunity to the petitioner No.1 and the respondent Nos.4 and 5 and submitted the report before the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Amravati.

6 On perusal of the aforesaid report, it reveals that the respondent Nos.4 and 5 committed financial irregularities while holding the post of Sarpancha and Upsarchanch and therefore, the petitioner No.1 filed the application before the respondent No.1-Additional Commissioner, Amravati, sought removal of the respondent Nos.4 to 7 from the post of membership of the respondent No.3 village panchayat.

7 It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that as per the provision of Section 39(4) of the Maharashtra Village Panchayat Act, 1958, it is incumbent to decide the application by the Additional Commissioner within two months, from filing

of the application, however, till date the Chief Executive Officer did not file his/her report though it is required to be filed within a period of one month.

**8** He further submitted that considering the nature of the allegation against the respondent Nos.4 to 7, the authority below is expected to decide the application in a time bound manner, which is not decided in a time bound manner.

**9** At present the charge of the Sarpanch is with the Administrative Officer (Administrator) and till the Additional Commissioner decides the application/representation of the petitioner No.1, the charge should be kept with the administrator.

**10** The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that at present the respondent No.4 is the only eligible candidate to hold the post of Sarpanch, which is reserved for Scheduled Tribe (ST) and if she is elected as Sarpanch, there will be imputation of the irregularities and financial gain and therefore, till the Additional Commissioner decides the application, the charge of the Sarpanch be continued with the Administrator.

**11** Issue notice to the respondents, returnable **after vacation**.

**12** The learned AGP waives service of notice for the State and raised objection to the petition and submitted that the elections of the Sarpanch and Upsarpanch are scheduled on 28.05.2024 and if the charge is kept with the Administrator, then purpose of

holding the elections could not be satisfied. In view of that, he prays for rejection of the prayer.

**13** After hearing both the parties on perusal of the report of the Assistant Block Development Officer it reveals that, there was financial irregularities committed by the respondent Nos.4 and 5 during their tenure. The representation filed by the petitioner No.1 is under consideration before the Additional Commissioner. At present the entire charge of the post of Sarpanch is with the Administrator. Considering the allegations which are severe in nature, it would be in the interest of justice to continue the charge of the post of Sarpanch with the Administrator.

**14** In view of that, relief is granted in view prayer clause- 'd', by directing that the financial charge of the post of Sarpanch, be continued with the Administrator, till the appearance of the respondent Nos.4 to 18

**[URMILA JOSHI-PHALKE, J.]**