



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

62 WRIT PETITION NO. 6861 OF 2025

SADHNA RAVIKANTRAO DESHMUKH

VERSUS

THE COLLECTOR, PARBHANI AND OTHERS

...

Mr. Mahesh P. Kale, Advocate for the Petitioner

Mr. P. D. Patil, AGP for Respondents-State

Mr. Rahul D. Khadap, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 3 to 16

....

CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.

DATE : 16.06.2025

PER COURT :-

. The petitioner impugns the order dated 09.05.2025 passed by respondent No.1 in dispute No.2025/Sa.Pra./Gra.Pan.Ni.-2/Pra.Kra.02 and Resolution dated 05.03.2025 passed against petitioner in special meeting of Gram Panchayat of village Kausadi, Tq. Jintur Dist. Parbhani.

2. Petitioner was elected as member of Gram Panchayat. On 25.02.2025, respondent moved a requisition for no confidence motion against the petitioner. Accordingly, a special meeting was convened on 05.03.2025, during which no confidence motion was passed. Petitioner challenged the Resolution dated 05.03.2025 by way of dispute before the Collector, Parbhani who dismissed the dispute upholding no confidence motion.

3. Mr. Kale, learned Advocate appearing for petitioner vehemently submits that petitioner was not given opportunity to defend himself. No confidence motion is violative of principles of natural justice. Petitioner was not even served with notice of no

confidence by Tahsildar. Although he was present in the meeting, the motion was passed in a hurried manner without discussion on the charges. As such, the entire proceeding was contrary to the spirit of the provisions contained in Village Panchayats Act.

4. Learned AGP, however supports the impugned order.

5. Having considered submissions advanced and perusal of record it is discernable that 14 members of Village panchayat moved requisition dated 25.02.2025 against petitioner for no confidence. Eventually, notices were issued by Tahsildar and the meeting of no confidence took place on 05.03.2025. The resolution is passed by majority of 14 against one. The proceeding shows that petitioner has participated in meeting and put up her stand.

6. The fact remains that petitioner has lost confidence with huge majority, accordingly no confidence motion has been passed. Once petitioner has participated in the proceeding of no confidence motion, the argument that the notice of no confidence was not properly served cannot be countenanced. No other grounds to make out any case for interference in the impugned order is made out. In result, writ petition stands dismissed.

[S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.]

HRJadhav