



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

**1095 WRIT PETITION NO. 11054 OF 2025**

**SHIVAJI BABASAHEB GORE**

**VERSUS**

**THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH PRINCIPAL  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS**

**AND**

**1096 WRIT PETITION NO. 11055 OF 2025**

**SANGITA RAJUSING JARWAL**

**VERSUS**

**THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH PRINCIPAL  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS**

**AND**

**1097 WRIT PETITION NO. 11056 OF 2025**

**SANJAY PANDHARINATH GHAYVAT**

**VERSUS**

**THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH PRINCIPAL  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS**

**AND**

**1098 WRIT PETITION NO. 11057 OF 2025**

**MALATI BABASAHEB RAUT**

**VERSUS**

**THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH PRINCIPAL  
SECRETARY AND OTHERS**

....

Mr. S. P. Nimbalkar, Advocate for the Petitioners

Mr. S. K. Tambe, Addl. G.P., Mr. S. G. Dhayal, Addl. G.P., Mr. S. P. Sonpawale, AGP and Mr. V. M. Kagne, AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 to 3

Mr. Sachindra Shetye, Advocate for Respondent No.4

....

CORAM : MANISH PITALE AND  
Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.

DATE : 24.09.2025

PER COURT :-

1. In these petitions, by order dated 10.09.2025, notice was issued returnable today. While issuing notice itself it was noted that these petitions challenged finalization of ward formation, whereby boundaries of electoral divisions / electoral colleges were finalized by the respondent authorities.

2. The learned AGP appears for the State authorities, while Mr. Shetye learned counsel appears on behalf of the respondent State Election Commission in all these petitions.

3. In a recent judgment and order dated 19.09.2025, this Court dismissed a number of petitions raising identical issues while challenging the finalization of ward formation. In the said judgment passed in *Writ Petition No.10237 of 2025 (Abhijeet s/o Diliprao Deshmukh Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others)* and connected petitions, this Court took into consideration the position of law by referring to a number of judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court as

well as this Court. It was concluded that the scope of interference under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in such matters is extremely narrow and that issues like inclusion or exclusion of villages in electoral divisions / electoral colleges, cannot be interfered with on merits. This Court would consider the procedure adopted while carrying out the aforesaid exercise and if the procedure is found to be reasonable and in accordance with law, this Court in Writ jurisdiction would not sit in appeal over the finalisation of boundaries and this Court would not supplant its wisdom in such matters.

4. In this context, we have considered the material on record in all these petitions. It is evident that respondent Divisional Commissioner, while taking the final decision has taken into account the inputs given by the Deputy Collector / Tahsildar as well as the Collector of the district. The reasons have been recorded in detail while finalizing the boundaries in a particular manner, which included the process of including / excluding villages. The Government order dated 12.06.2025 has been followed to the hilt by the State authorities and therefore, we find that there is no scope for interference in these petitions.

5. We rely upon the detailed reasoning contained in the said judgment and order passed in the case of *Abhijeet s/o Diliprao Deshmukh Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others (supra)*.

6. In view of the above, these Writ Petitions are dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

[ Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J. ]

[ MANISH PITALE, J. ]

SMS