



shakuntala

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO.181 OF 2025

GAJANAN D. PHADTE

... PETITIONER

Versus

STATE OF GOA, THR. CHIEF
SECRETARY AND 8 ORS

... RESPONDENTS

Mr. Clayton Fonseca, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Ms. Sulekha Kamat, Additional Government Advocate for
Respondent Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 and 8.

Ms. Prajali Tari, Advocate for Respondent No. 3.

Ms. Kalpa Govekar, Advocate for Respondent No. 9.

**CORAM:- BHARATI DANGRE &
NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, JJ.**

DATED :- 30th June, 2025

P.C.

1. In compliance with the notice issued by this Court, the petitioner has filed an affidavit which is affirmed on 05/05/2025.

Along with the said affidavit, the petitioner has placed on record the notice issued under Section 66(3) of the Goa Panchayat Raj Act, 1994, to the respondent no. 9.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is that after great persuasion, the notice is issued to the Village Panchayat, but though power under Section 66 of the Goa Panchayat Raj Act has been invoked, there is no Stop Work Notice issued to the noticee.

The learned counsel for the Panchayat has instructions to make a

statement that a Stop Work Notice has been issued.

3. In the wake of the aforesaid statement coming from the Panchayat, we expect the notice issued by it to be taken to its logical conclusion and if the Stop Work Notice is not yet issued, as contended by the petitioner, since it is the mandate of Section 66 of the Goa Panchayat Raj Act, the same shall be immediately issued.

Now that the Panchayat has sprung into action and will take its action to a logical conclusion in accordance with law, we dispose of the writ petition.

NIVEDITA P. MEHTA, J.

BHARATI DANGRE, J.