



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

Writ Petition No. 2331 of 2025

[Priti w/o Manoj Bundile ..vs.. Hon'ble Minister, Rural Development,
Mantralaya, Mumbai and ors.]

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. N. A. Gawande, Advocate for petitioner
Mr. K. R. Lule, AGP for the State
Ms. A. R. Sharma, Advocate h/f Mr. P. R. Agrawal, Advocate for
caveator/respondent no. 5

CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE J.

DATED : 29-04-2025

Heard.

Learned counsel for respondent no. 5 tendered
across the bar affidavit of reply. Same is taken on record.

The petitioner has been disqualified under Section
39(1) of the Maharashtra Village Panchayats Act, 1959 with the
allegation that her husband was caught raid handed while
accepting bribe of Rs. 4,000/-. The bribe was allegedly
accepted for issuing no due certificate to one Rambhau.

With the assistance of counsels of both the sides, I
have gone through the material placed before me to find that
there is absolutely nothing in the First Information Report or
panchanama or any other document to indicate that the
petitioner's husband acted at the behest of the petitioner.
Despite such status, the authorities below viz. respondent
nos. 1 and 2 have held that the petitioner is guilty of
misconduct and/or disgraceful conduct.

Issue notice, returnable on 11-6-2025.

In the meantime, there shall be stay to the
impugned order dated 12-3-2025 (Annexure O) passed by

respondent no. 1. Needless to say that the order passed by respondent no. 2 shall stand stayed having merged into order passed by respondent no. 1.

Learned Assistant Government Pleader waives notice for respondent nos. 1 and 2 and learned counsel Ms. A. R. Sharma waives notice for caveator - respondent no. 5.

The petitioner shall comply with practice note no. 14 of the Bombay High Court Appellate Side Rules, 1960; particularly Clause (5) thereof.

(Anil L. Pansare, J.)

wasnik