

JVS.

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 16983 OF 2025

Digitally
signed by
BASAVRAJ
GURAPPA
PATIL
Date:
2025.12.25
12:36:25
+0530

Akil Fakaruddin Ambekari } Petitioner
Versus
The Election Officer, Karad & Ors. } Respondents

Mr. Shailesh Chavan i/b. Mr. Milind Deshmukh,
Advocates for the Petitioner.

Mr. S. B. Shetye, Advocate for State Election Commission.

Ms. Neha S. Bhide, Government Pleader with Mr. O. A.
Chandurkar, Additional Government Pleader, Mr. V. G.
Badgujar, AGP, Ms. G. R. Raghuwanshi, AGP and
Ms. Pooja Patil, AGP for State.

**CORAM: SHREE CHANDRASHEKHAR, C.J. &
GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.**

DATE: 22nd DECEMBER 2025

P.C.:

In Election Appeal No. 1 of 2025, the petitioner laid a challenge to the order dated 18th November 2025 passed by the Election Officer, Karad Municipal Council by which the Election Officer has rejected the nomination of the petitioner. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 24th November 2025 passed by the District Judge, Karad in Election Appeal No. 1 of 2025.

2. As to the maintainability of a writ petition to challenge the rejection of a nomination form by the Returning Officer, a Full Bench of this Court in “*Karma Veer Tulshiram Autade v. State Election Commission, Mumbai*” 2021 2 Mh.L.J. 349 referred to Article 243 of the Constitution of India and held that filing of a writ petition is not a plea to subserve the progress of election and/or

facilitate its completion, as indicated in “*Mohinder Singh Gil & Anr. v. Chief Election Commissioner, New Delhi*” (1978) 1 SCC 405. The Full Bench held as under:-

“68. For the reasons aforesaid, while agreeing with the view in Vinod Pandurang Bharsakade (supra), we answer the fundamental question as formulated in paragraph 27 in the negative. As a sequel thereto, we answer the questions referred by the Division Bench in the manner as follows:

(i) Allowing a challenge in a writ petition to rejection of nomination form to contest an election and granting the relief claimed by setting aside such order of rejection is definitely not a step to subserve the progress of election and/or facilitate its completion in the sense enunciated in Mohinder Singh Gill (supra) and explained in Ashok Kumar (supra) though it may not always amount to intervention, obstruction or protraction of the election;

(ii) Article 243-0(b) of the Constitution of India is a bar for entertaining a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution against an order passed by the Returning Officer rejecting nomination paper and such provision would clearly be attracted whenever a writ petition is presented before a Court for its consideration; and

(iii) The law laid down in Vinod Pandurang Bharsakade (supra) represents the correct view of law; consequently, we hold that the decision in. Smt. Mayaraju Ghavghave (supra) and Sudhakar s/o Vitthal Misal (supra) do not lay down the correct law

3. A writ petition challenging the order passed by the District Judge allowing a challenge to the rejection or acceptance of the nomination form shall also not lie. The remedy for the aggrieved person is now to file an election petition after the result is declared.

3. In view thereof, Writ Petition No.16983 of 2025 is dismissed.

[GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J.]

[CHIEF JUSTICE]