



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.9372 OF 2025

Balasaheb s/o Vasantrao Subhedar
Age: 37 years, Occu.: Agri. And Social Service,
R/o. Chh. Sambhaji Raje Colony,
Jadhavwadi Road, Dharashiv,
District Dharashiv

.. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra
Through Gramvikas Department,
Bandhkam Bhavan, 25 Marjbandh Fort,
Mumbai 400 001.
2. Deputy Secretary,
Gramvikas Vibhag,
Bandhkam Bhavan, 25 Marjbandh Fort,
Mumbai 400 001.
3. Chief Executive Officer,
Zilla Parishad, Dharashiv,
District Dharashiv.
4. Bhagwat s/o Rambhau Dhawalshank
Age: 60 years, Occu.: Pensioner,
R/o. Dharashiv, Chh. Sambhajinagar Road,
Bhanu Nagar Dharashiv,,
District Dharashiv.

.. Respondents

...

Mr. Sushant B. Choudhari, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. S. D. Ghayal, Additional G. P. for respondent No.1/State.

...

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

DATE : 13 OCTOBER 2025

ORDER :

. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner and learned AGP for respondent No.1. There is no necessity to issue notice to the other respondents.

2. Present petitioner has filed the petition to quash and set aside the communication issued by respondent No.2 dated 31.05.2024 thereby continuation of the promotion of one Bhagwat Rambhau Dhavalshankh. It is to be noted that the petitioner claims that he is the resident of Dharashiv and he is an agriculturist by profession. He is also a social activist and has filed many complaints against illegal activities allegedly done by the Government Servants as well as politicians. According to him, respondent No.4 Bhagwat Dhavalshankh was initially appointed as Gramsevak on 21.12.1990. She had not cleared Departmental Examination within a period of four years and, therefore, he was not entitled to continue the service. Even after he was not qualified as Gramsevak, yet he was promoted as village development officer in 1996. Again he was promoted on the post of Extension Officer (Panchayat) without considering his entitlement to continue in the service. The promotion that was lastly granted is on 06.10.1999. It is then stated that respondent No.4 cleared the departmental exam on 26/27.12.1998 and result was declared. Further,

it is stated that respondent No.3 submitted detailed information in respect of complaint made by the petitioner on 28.05.2024 and thereafter, letter respondent No.2 sent communication to respondent No.3 stating that though it is admitted that promotion to respondent No.4 is wrongly granted, however, that is the mistake committed by Administration and it is clarified that the promotion granted to respondent No.4 be continued as he is likely to be superannuated on 31.05.2024. Hence, this petition.

3. At the outset, it is to be noted that the petitioner states that he is an agriculturist and a social activist and he has filed many complaints against the alleged illegal activities done by the Government Officers as well as political persons. Considering the prayers made in the petition challenging the promotion given to respondent No.4, who was ex-employee of respondent No.3 Zilla Parishad, Dharashiv, in our considered view the petitioner has no locus standi to challenge the same. Therefore, at the time of hearing of the petition, we have asked the learned Advocate for the petitioner to deposit amount of Rs.5,00,000/- to show his *bona fides*, so that the petition can be considered. However, the learned Advocate for the petitioner, upon instructions from the petitioner, refused to deposit the same by saying that he would deposit a very meager amount. On the ground alone, the petition deserves to be dismissed.

4. Even if we consider the facts of the case, it is to be noted that initially respondent No.4 was appointed as Gramsevak by respondent No.3 on 21.12.1990 and thereafter, he was promoted as Village Development Officer in the year 1999. By way of present petition, which has been filed on 04.07.2024, the petitioner is challenging the said promotion of respondent No.4 in the year 1999. Thus, there is an inordinate delay in challenging the same, which has not been explained at all by the present petitioner.

5. For the aforesaid reasons, the writ petition stands dismissed at the threshold.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm