



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO.10534 OF 2025

Dattatraya Narayan Jadhav ... Petitioner
versus
The State of Maharashtra and Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. Chetan Patil with Mr. Bhushan Jadhav, for Petitioner.
Ms. Savina Crasto, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 to 4.

CORAM: N.J.JAMADAR, J.

DATE : 6 AUGUST 2025

P.C.

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.
2. The challenge in this Petition is to an order dated 10 June 2025 passed by the District Collector. In the wake of the resolution passed by the Gramsabha of Village Panchayat Ambawade, Tal. Panhala, to revoke the FL-III licence granted in favour of the Petitioner, the District Collector has directed that a vote, by secret ballot, of the women voters of Ambawade be held on the proposal to close the establishment run by the Petitioner, on the strength of the said FL-III licence.
3. Mr. Patil, the learned Counsel for the Petitioner, submitted that the actions taken by the Village Panchayat and the District Collector, Kolhapur, are in breach of the Bombay Prohibition (Closure of licence on Resolution by

Gram Sabha or representation by Voters in the Ward of Municipal Council/Corporation) Order, 2008. The initial resolution was not passed by the Gram Sabha in conformity with the provisions contained in Rule 3(2) and (3) of the said Rules, 2008. Since the initial resolution was not passed in conformity with the said rules, the impugned order passed by the District Collector on the basis of the 2009 Amendment in the said Rules, giving another option to the women members of the Village Panchayat to seek closure of the liquor outlet by submitting a report of non less than 25% of the female voters, is equally infirm.

4. Mr. Patil further submitted that pursuant to the impugned order of the Collector dated 10 June 2025, voting has been held and by an order dated 22 July 2025, the District Collector had directed to close the business in relation to FL-III No.1320 at Village Ambawade, Tal. Panhala and the Petitioner has been directed to submit a proposal to transfer the said licence.

5. Since the voting in terms of the impugned order has already been held and the establishment where the licence was being operated, has been directed to be closed, at this stage, there is no propriety in entertaining the Petition against the impugned order.

6. In this view of the matter, keeping open the liberty to the Petitioner to assail the order dated 22 July 2025, the Writ Petition stands disposed.

7. All contentions raised in this Petition are kept open for consideration in

the event the order directing the closure of the licensed establishment at Village Ambawade, is challenged.

(N.J.JAMADAR, J.)