



Andreza

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO. 696 OF 2024

Namdev Toraskar, s/o Dharma Toraskar, ... Petitioner
48 years, Indian National, r/o. H. No. 387,
Danda, Siolim, Bardez, Goa.

Versus

1. State of Goa, through its Chief ...Respondents
Secretary, Having office at Legislative
Assembly, Porvorim, Bardez, Goa.
2. V. P. Siolim-Marna, Through its
Secretary, Siolim, Bardez, Goa.
3. The Block Development Officer,
Mapusa, Bardez, Goa.
4. The Deputy Director of Panchayat,
Patto Panaji, Tiswadi, Goa.
5. The Deputy Collector, Mapusa, Bardez,
Goa.
6. Mr. Siddesh Dhabolkar, s/o. Gurudas
Dhabolkar, Major of age, Indian National,
r/o. /H. No. 348, Dando, Siolim, Bardez-
Goa.

Mr. Kapil Kerkar, Advocate *for the Petitioner.*

Mr. D. Pangam, Advocate General *with Mr. S. Samant,
Additional Government Advocate for the Respondent nos. 1, 2,
3 and 4.*

**CORAM: ALOK ARADHE, CJ. &
M. S. SONAK, J.**

DATE: 11th March, 2025

ORAL JUDGMENT *(Per Chief Justice)*

1. Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally with the consent of the parties.
2. Taking into account the nature of the order which this Court proposes to pass, it is not necessary to issue notice to respondent no. 6.
3. In this Writ Petition the petitioner *inter alia* seeks a direction to the Deputy Director of Panchayats to decide the complaint submitted by the petitioner in a time-bound manner.
4. The facts giving rise to the filing of this petition in a nutshell are that according to the petitioner, respondent no. 6 has raised illegal construction on land bearing survey no. 128/1 situated at Village Marna, Siolim. The petitioner thereupon made a complaint with regard to the aforesaid illegal construction which has been carried out by respondent no. 6. The complaint submitted by the petitioner failed to evoke any response. Hence, this petition.
5. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that the Writ Petition be disposed of with a direction to the Deputy Director of Panchayat to take an action on the complaint made by the petitioner in a time-bound manner.

6. This prayer has not been fairly opposed by the learned Advocate General and submitted that the complaint submitted by the petitioner shall be decided by the Deputy Director of Panchayats after affording an opportunity of hearing to the respondent no. 6 within such time that may be fixed by this Court.

7. In view of the aforesaid submissions and in the facts and submissions of the case, we deem it appropriate to dispose of the Writ Petition with a direction to the Deputy Director of Panchayats to afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner as well as respondent no. 6 and all other necessary parties and thereafter decide the complaints submitted by the petitioner within a period of three months from today.

8. It is clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

9. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of.

M. S. SONAK, J.

CHIEF JUSTICE