



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR
WRIT PETITION NO.3121/2025

Smt. Sarla Dadarao Ingale .Vs. State of Maharashtra 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. A. S. Deshpande, Advocate for petitioner.
Mr. A. G. Mate, A.G.P for respondent Nos. 1 and 2.
Mr. S. N. Chikhale, Advocate instructed by Mr. P. A. Kadu, Advocate for
respondent Nos. 6 to 11 and 13 to 17.
Mr. T. Deshpande, Advocate for respondent No.12.

CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE, J.

DATE : JULY 3, 2025

Heard.

2. Issue notice to the unserved respondents, returnable in the week commencing from 21.07.2025.

3. Mr. A. G. Mate, learned A.G.P for respondent Nos. 1 and 2, seeks time to file reply.

4. Mr. T. Deshpande, learned counsel for respondent No.12, also seeks time to take instructions on the count that respondent No.12 is not in contact with him.

5. Mr. S. N. Chikhale, learned counsel appears for respondent Nos.6 to 11 and 13 to 17. He submits that complete set of petition has been given to him today itself and seeks time.

6. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner has requested for interim relief. Argument is that Chief Executive Officer has himself not conducted inquiry as required under Section 39 of the Maharashtra Village Panchayats Act, 1959. According to the petitioner, opportunity of hearing was not given to her.

7. Further argument is that the Chief Executive Officer has delegated his powers of inquiry to the Block Development Officer, who has filed report and the entire report is accepted as it is. In fact, the report has been reproduced in the order.

8. Learned A.G.P and counsel appearing for respondents have invited my attention to the inquiry conducted by the Chief Executive Officer.

9. The introductory paragraphs, though refer to the report of the Block Development Officer, the Chief Executive Officer has also mentioned that on 21.05.2024, he himself has conducted the inquiry. The petitioner and complainant were heard. He has considered the report and the documents placed before me.

10. Thus, prima facie, it appears that the Chief Executive Officer has himself conducted inquiry and that he has taken help of the Block Development Officer. That being so, interim relief as sought is refused.

11. The respondents shall file reply before the next date, failing which the petition shall proceed without reply.

(Anil L. Pansare, J.)