



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

**WRIT PETITION NO.6879 OF 2025**

SIDDHARTH JAGANNATH DHOKE

VERSUS

THE DIVISIONAL COMMISSIONER, NAGPUR DIVISION, NAGPUR AND  
OTHERS

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

Mr. R.A. Ghosh, Advocate for Petitioner.

Ms. D.V. Sapkal, AGP for Respondent Nos.1, 2 & 4-State.

**CORAM : PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.**

**DATED : 19<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2025**

1. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner.
2. The petitioner has challenged the order dated 01.09.2023, passed by respondent No.1 Divisional Commissioner, Nagpur Division, Nagpur and order dated 08.02.2023, passed by respondent No.2 Collector, Nagpur, by which the petitioner is disqualified from the post of Member of Gram Panchayat Davlamehti, Dist. Nagpur, under Section 14(1)(j-3) of the Maharashtra Village Panchayats Act.
3. It is pointed out that these orders were earlier subjected to challenge vide Writ Petition no.6544 of 2023, which was dismissed by order dated 27.10.2023, passed by this Court, by observing that the

petitioner was not in a position to indicate any order of regularization of encroachment/construction about which the encroachment was inferred by the authorities and resultant disqualification.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that there is a certificate issued by Block Development Officer, dated 25.01.2023, mentioning therein that the petitioner was given the benefit of *Gharkul* scheme, however, there is no order of regularization of encroachment.

5. Having regard to the fact that there is no document in the nature of regularization of encroachment and by considering the fact that the earlier writ petition was dismissed, which is not challenged by the petitioner, the instant petition need not be entertained and it deserves to be dismissed.

6. In view of this, the writ petition is dismissed with no order as to costs.

**(PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.)**

asd