



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

911 WRIT PETITION NO. 4267 OF 2025

URMILA BHAGWAT DESHMUKH ALIAS URMILA BABAN TALPE

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND OTHERS

Mr.A.S. Lokhande, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.K.S. Patil, AGP for the respondent-State.

CORAM : KISHORE C. SANT, J.

DATE : 28.03.2025

PC :-

01. The petitioner has challenged an order passed by the learned Collector, Jalna dated 12.09.2024 declaring the petitioner disqualified under section 10-1A of the Maharashtra Village Panchayats Act. The learned Advocate for the petitioner points out that the Tahsildar has issued communication to the learned Collector on 04.10.2024, providing information of the members who have filed validity certificate and of the members who have not filed validity certificate within stipulated period. He point out that at Sr. No.6 of the list of members, name of the petitioner appears showing that she had submitted caste validity certificate. He thus submits that though validity certificate is submitted, still the learned Collector has disqualified the petitioner.

02. Learned AGP opposes the petition. He submits that though the name of the petitioner appears in the list of the members, who submitted caste validity certificate, however, he points out that said certificate was submitted on 29.09.2024 i.e. after 09.07.2024, a cut of date. He submits that in view of section 10-1A of the Act and in view of

temporary extension of 2023, the certificate was not submitted before the cut-off date. Though the Tahsildar sent the report, it is of no use. The petitioner does not get benefit of the same. Learned AGP thus opposes the petition.

03. This Court has heard the submissions and has gone through the communication sent by the Tahsildar to the learned Collector. It does appear that the name of the petitioner is at Sr.No.6, in the list of the members showing the names of the members who submitted caste validity certificate. Looking to the fact that it is not submitted in time, this Court finds that the learned Collector has not committed any illegality in passing the order.

04. Considering above, this Court finds that no case is made out calling for interference at the hands of this Court. The petition, therefore, stands dismissed, with no order as to costs.

[KISHORE C. SANT, J.]