



Maria S.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA
WRIT PETITION NO.59 OF 2024

Rosalina De Souza e Lobo, aged 49 years, ... Petitioner
Indian National, r/o. h.no.11/1, Vancio
Waddo, Guirim, Bardez-Goa.

Versus

1. Village Panchayat of Guirim, Through its
Secretary, Guirim, Bardez, Goa.

2. Sandeep Uttam Vazarkar, R/o. Vancio ...Respondents
Vaddo, Guirim, Bardez-Goa.

Mr. Prasheen Lotlikar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

**Mr. Vishwadh Sardessai, Additional Government
Advocate for the Respondent no. 1.**

Mr. Shivan Desai, Advocate for the Respondent no. 2.

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

DATE: 11th March, 2025

1. Heard learned Counsel for the parties.
2. Rule.
3. Rule is made returnable immediately at the request and with the consent of learned Counsel for the parties.
4. In this Writ Petition, the Petitioner is aggrieved by the inaction on the part of the Respondent No.1 in dealing with the compliant dated 02.12.2022 filed by the Petitioner against Respondent No.2 with regard to the illegal construction.
5. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the complaint submitted by the Petitioner dated 02.12.2022 is pending before the

Village Panchayat. However, it has failed to take any action on the complaint of the Petitioner. It is submitted that the Writ Petition be disposed of with directions to the Village Panchayat to decide the complaint submitted by the Petitioner after affording an opportunity of hearing to the Petitioner in a time bound manner. Learned Counsel for the Respondents have not opposed the aforesaid prayer made by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner.

6. In view of the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the parties and taking into account that the complaint is pending before adjudication before the Village Panchayat since 02.12.2022, the Writ Petition is disposed of with directions to the Village Panchayat to consider and decide the complaint submitted by the Petitioner after affording opportunity of hearing to the parties within a period of two months from today.

7. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on merits of the matter.

8. Accordingly, this Petition is disposed of.

M. S. SONAK, J.

CHIEF JUSTICE