



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

2 WRIT PETITION NO.11646 OF 2025

Mahendra Raghunath Wahule

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through The Principal Secretary And Others

...

Mr. A. M. Reddy, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. S. B. Narwade, AGP for Respondents/State.

...

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

DATE : 22 DECEMBER 2025

ORDER :

. In view of our order dated 08.03.2025, the petitioner has filed additional affidavit. We have heard the learned Advocate for the petitioner and perused the affidavit of the petitioner.

2. In our order, we had raised objection regarding photocopies of the Aadhar Cards of the family members of respondent No.6 being attached to the petition. We had questioned as to how the custody of the photocopies of the Aadhar Cards are with the petitioner and therefore, the explanation was called. Now, very interesting affidavit has been filed stating that the petitioner has received the copies of Aadhar Cards of respondent No.6's family members from wife of respondent No.6.

According to the petitioner, she has given the photocopies stating that respondent No.6 is having three children. The petitioner has now disclosed that the original custodian of the Aadhar Card of the family members is wife of respondent No.6. The wife of respondent No.6 is having some dispute with respondent No.6 and since the petitioner is a social activist, the wife of respondent No.6 has given those copies of Aadhar Cards to him. The petitioner states that there was no ill intention on the part of him to annex the photocopies. He has also tendered unconditional apology and has also undertaken that henceforth he will not attach the photocopies of Aadhar Cards of a person without the consent of that person. We had also raised the point that when it was the photocopy, how the Advocate for the petitioner could have endorsed it as true copy. But then the petitioner appears to have taken it upon himself and states that since the copies were supplied by the wife of respondent No.6, the Advocate has endorsed it as true copy.

3. We are absolutely not satisfied with the reasons given. When the petitioner is claiming himself as social activist, then social work can be done without taking the advantage of the dispute between a family. Even if it would have been told (for the sake of arguments it is accepted whatever the petitioner is saying is true) it should have been the endeavor of the petitioner to resolve the dispute between the husband

and wife i.e. respondent No.6 and his wife, but it should not have been to attack respondent No.6 in such a way. The affidavit is silent on the point that any such efforts for reconciliation of the dispute between the husband and wife was tried by the petitioner and, therefore, whatever he is doing cannot be termed as social activity. Rather, this is an example of taking advantage of the dispute between the third parties and try to gain something. If at all respondent No.6 has violated any rule of service and respondent No.6 wife has any objection or want to take revenge, then she was at liberty, but she ought not to have or cannot take help of the petitioner to teach a lesson to respondent No.6 and, therefore, we are not satisfied with the explanation given by the petitioner so also the way the matter has been handled by the petitioner. Unnecessarily time of this Court has been taken and, therefore, we propose to impose cost on the petitioner.

4. By our order dated 08.12.2025, we had asked the learned Advocate for the petitioner to argue on the next date i.e. today and also to deposit amount of Rs.5,00,000/- to show his *bona fides* within a period of two weeks. Now, it is stated that the petitioner is not financially capable enough to deposit amount of Rs.5,00,000/- and he prays for relaxation of the said condition, however, taking into consideration the way the matter is handled, we are not inclined to relax the said

condition. Before we conclude, we must also then give an advise to the learned Advocate for the petitioner that he should take care henceforth when he is drafting a petition and annexing documents.

5. We dismiss the writ petition by imposing cost on the petitioner.

6. Petitioner to deposit cost of Rs.50,000/- with the High Court Legal Service Sub Committee, Aurangabad on or before 17.01.2026.

7. Place the matter for compliance on 19.01.2026, First on Board.

8. We may also state that if the amount is not deposited, then that may be recovered as arrears of land revenue, for which the decision would be taken on 19.01.2026.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm