2026:BHC-AUG:54688

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

902 CONT. PETITION NO. 277 OF 2010
IN WP/2637/2010

SUNANDA AMBADASRAO PISAL AND ANR
VERSUS
SHRI.G.R. KHARAT , ADDL. COLLECTOR AND ORS
...
Mr. S. N. Gaikwad h/f. Mr. N. V. Gaware, Advocate for the Petitioners
Mr. K. B. Jadhavar, AGP for Respondent-State
Mr. S. S. Wagh h/f. Mr. S. T. Shelke, Advocate for Respondent No.2
...

CORAM : AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, J.
DATED : 03.11.2026

P.C. :-

. Alleging that the respondents have committed contempt of the interim order dated 25.03.2010 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.2637 of 2010, the original writ petitioners have approached this Court.

2. Suffice to note that the petitioners were democratically elected Sarpanch and Upsarpanch respectively of village Karjat. They suffered disqualification at the hands of the Additional Collector, Ahmednagar vide order dated 06.03.2010 under Sections 14 and 16 of the Maharashtra Village Panchayats Act, 1958 on account of failure to conduct

the mandatory meetings within the stipulated period. The petitioners challenged the said order before this Court in Writ Petition No.2637 of 2010.

3. Upon hearing the petitioners, this Court on 25.03.2010, issued notice to respondent Nos.2, 3 and 4 therein making those returnable on 08.04.2010. This Court further directed as follows:

> "In the meantime, order passed by Additional Collector, Ahmednagar, is kept in abeyance."

4. It is the contention of the learned Advocate for the petitioners that subsequently, the concerned Gramsevak did not allow them to perform their duties as Sarpanch and Upsarpanch. He submits that there are various communications issued by him thereby demonstrating that the disqualification order was kept in abeyance by this Court and that the petitioners were entitled to perform their functions as Sarpanch and Upsarpanch.

5. He would submit that subsequently the writ petition itself was rendered infructuous since the tenure of the local body came to an end on 11.03.2011. However, it is contended that the concerned Gramsevak and the BDO disallowed them from functioning as Sarpanch and Upsarpanch, respectively.

Contending that such acts were in violation of the order passed by this Court, the present proceedings have been initiated.

6. With the able assistance of the learned Advocate for the petitioners, I have gone through the various communications annexed to the Contempt Petition. Learned Advocate for the petitioners however, could not produce anything on record to demonstrate that the concerned officers i.e. the Gramsevak and the BDO had prevented them from acting as Sarpanch and Upsarpanch. He submits that there were certain acts on the part of these responsible officers which are not evident from any document, however, they exploited the petitioners by misusing their official position.

7. For the purpose of initiating contempt action against government servants or any other party, this Court has to see whether any contempt is revealed from the material placed on record. The petitioners have miserably failed to demonstrate any such contempt.

8. In view this, Contempt Petition stands dismissed.

(AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, J.)

PRW