



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 3415 OF 2025

SMT. SUKESHNI MAROTI ASUTKAR

...Vs...

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA, THROUGH, THE COLLECTOR, YAVATMAL AND ANOTHER

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders
---	---------------------------

Ms. Sonali M.Tripathi, Advocate for petitioner.
Ms. M. H.Deshmukh, AGP for respondent/State.

**CORAM: ANIL S. KILOR AND
RAJNISH R. VYAS, JJ.**

DATED : 05th DECEMBER, 2025.

Heard.

2. The petitioner has approached this Court by filing the present Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, assailing the permanent cancellation of Setu Suvidha Kendra allotted to her, vide order dated 20/05/2025 passed in Appeal bearing No. 1/2024 by the respondent authority.

3. After hearing both the parties and on perusal of the record, we are of the opinion that the matter needs to be remanded back to the respondent authority. Hence, there is no need to go into the details of the facts, whereas, it would suffice to state that the petitioner is running a Setu Suvidha Kendra for the last 12-13 years and there were no complaints during this period. However, from January, 2024 onward, suddenly, certain complaints were there and one video was submitted to the concerned authority to show that the excess amount was demanded by the petitioner.

Thereafter, the inquiry was conducted and on the basis of such inquiry, the allotment of Setu Suvidha Kendra was cancelled.

4. In an Appeal, the Collector vide impugned order dated 20/05/2025 maintained the order of cancellation of Setu Suvidha Kendra of the petitioner.

5. Having gone through the impugned order, it is evident that an opportunity of hearing was granted to the petitioner and during such hearing, the petitioner had submitted the written submissions. It was pointed out by the petitioner that she was running a Setu Suvidha Kendra for last 12-13 years and there was no complaint. Then a video was made viral, which doesn't prove any allegation but only shows that, there was a demand of Rs. 1,500/-, but for what purpose, such amount was asked by the petitioner, is not clear.

6. It is therefore, submitted that without any evidence or without considering the case of the petitioner as put forth by the petitioner before the Collector by way of the written submissions, the Collector dismissed the appeal.

7. It is evident that the Collector has not recorded a single reason for not accepting any of the points raised by the petitioner in her written submissions. The Collector ought to have considered that the petitioner is running such center for last 12-13 years and earlier there were no complaints and suddenly, from 2024 onward, there were complaints. The Collector ought to have more careful while

accepting the allegations against such center and unless the sufficient material is placed on record, the Collector ought not to have come to the conclusion that the complaints against the petitioner are genuine. The Collector should not have cancelled the center of the petitioner without recording a single reason and without considering the case of the petitioner.

8. In that view of the matter, we are of the opinion that the impugned order needs to be quashed and set aside and the matter is required to be remanded back to the Collector.

9. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is **partly allowed**.

10. The order dated 20/05/2025 passed by the respondent no. 1 – Collector, Yavatmal is hereby quashed and set aside and the matter is remanded back to the Collector, Yavatmal to decide afresh after taking into consideration the written submissions of the petitioner and after granting an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.

11. The petitioner shall appear before the Collector, Yavatmal on 10/12/2025 at 11.00 a.m.

12. After hearing the petitioner and after considering the written submissions submitted by the petitioner on 09/02/2024 or if any additional written submissions filed by the petitioner while appearing before the Collector, the Collector shall take a decision afresh on the appeal filed by the petitioner.

13. Such decision shall be taken within a period of two weeks from the date of appearance of the petitioner and communicate the decision to the petitioner within one week from the date of such decision.

14. Accordingly, the petition stands **disposed of**.

(RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)

B.T.K.