



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 137/2025

Smt. Anita Devashish Mandal Vs. Tahsildar, Tahsil Office, Armori, Dist. Gadchiroli

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. V. N. Morande, Advocate for Petitioner.
Mr. D. P. Thakare, Addl.G.P. for Respondent No.1/State.
Mr. B. S. Dhandale, Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 to 7.

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE AND
MRS.VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, JJ.

DATED : 13/02/2025.

. We have seen the reply of the respondent No.1 wherein respondent – Tahsildar on 10.06.2024 addressed a communication to the members of the Gram Panchayat including the petitioner to postpone the meeting dated 14.06.2024 as the statutory period of two years for proceeding with the no confidence motion was not completed.

2. The learned Counsel for the petitioner Mr. Morande submits that such communication was never served by the office of Tahsildar and rather the meeting was attended by the petitioner and since none of the respondents have attended the meeting, the meeting was itself not held.

3. If the contentions of Mr. Morande, the learned Counsel are to be accepted, then there has to be a record to that effect in the Gram Panchayat which the petitioner in the capacity of Sarpanch has failed to produce on record. If the petitioner is claiming that the meeting was held which was not attended, the proceedings to that effect

should have been produced on record by the petitioner, which he has failed.

4. Apart from above, Mr. Morande, the learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner has claimed that the respondents must be put to notice to produce the acknowledgment, Inward and Outward register of the office of Tahsildar so as to demonstrate the service of communication dated 10.06.2024. We are unable to go into the said issue for two reasons. (a) The communication issued by Tahsildar dated 10.06.2024 is a public document bearing outward number and (b) that pursuant to the stand taken by the petitioner referred herein above, it was for the petitioner to discharge the burden thereby demonstrating that the meeting was convened, which was claimed to have been attended by the petitioner on 14.06.2024, which the petitioner has failed to.

5. In this background, there is no iota of evidence in favour of the petitioner to dispute the communication dated 10.06.2024 cancelling the meeting dated 14.06.2024.

6. That being so, the notice issued against the petitioner for conveying the meeting of no confidence motion, cannot be faulted with.

7. The petition in our opinion is devoid of merits, stands dismissed.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)