



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

13 WRIT PETITION NO.8165 OF 2025

1. Bhaurao Kisan Jadhav

2. Dilip Maroti Padol

.. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra
Through its Secretary,
Planning and M.R.E.G.S. Department,
Maharashtra State, Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

2. The District Collector,
Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar @
The President of the District Committee
For Redressal of Complaint of M.R.E.G.S.

3. The Deputy Collector,
Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar @
The President of the Taluka Committee
For Redressal of Complaint of M.R.E.G.S.

4. The Tahsildar,
Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar @
The President of the Taluka Committee
For Redressal of Complaint of M.R.E.G.S.

5. The Deputy Chief Executive Officer,
Zilla Parishad, Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar,
@ the Project Director M.R.E.G.S.
District Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar.

6. The Block Development Officer,
Panchayat Samiti, Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar.
@ Assistant President of the Taluka Committee
For Redressal of Complaint of M.R.E.G.S.

7. The Circle Officer,
Division Ladsawangi,
Taluka and District Chh. Sambhajinagar.
8. The Village Panchayat,
Sayyadpur, Taluka and Dist. Chh. Sambhajinagar,
Through its Secretary/Village Development
Officer/Gramsevak.
9. Kawshal Bhumbre
Age: 25 years,
Occu.: Service as a Technical Officer,
R/o. Panchayat Samiti,
Chh. Sambhajinagar.

.. Respondents

...
Mr. Vishal A. Bagal, Advocate for the Petitioners.
Mr. A. B. Girase, Government Pleader for Respondents/State.
Mr. S. B. Pulkundwar, Advocate for Respondent Nos.5 and 6.
...

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 13 OCTOBER 2025

ORDER :

. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner.

2. By order dated 04.03.2025 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.2989 of 2025, respondent No.2/Collector was directed to decide the communication dated 02.12.2024. Accordingly, it appears that the Collector, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar has decided the said communication

on 02.04.2025. Now, the petitioners want directions to respondent Nos.6 to 9 to implement the order of respondent No.2.

3. What we find that the petitioners have directly come to the High Court without approaching respondent No.2, thereby indicating that his order has not yet been implemented. When appropriate steps have not been taken by the petitioners, their petition cannot be entertained in the writ jurisdiction. The learned Advocate for the petitioners, upon such situation, seeks withdrawal of the petition with liberty to approach respondent No.2.

4. The writ petition stands dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as prayed.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm