IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

144 WRIT PETITION NO. 9189 OF 2026

Shankar Vishwanath Yevate And Another
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra Through Principal Secretary And Others
...
Mr. R.D. Biradar, Advocate for the Petitioners
Mr. B.B. Bhise, AGP for State
Mr. S.B. Pulkundwar, Advocate for Respondent No. 6

CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI AND
ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, JJ.

DATE : 22nd OCTOBER, 2026

PER COURT :

1. By this writ petition, petitioners challenges the order dated 20.04.2026 issued by the respondents in response to formation of wards in Yevati Village Panchayat, Tq. Mukhed, District- Nanded and seeks further directions to respondents for formation of ward No. 1 as per the Rule & objections of the petitioners dated 13.05.2026.

2. Heard learned advocate appearing for the petitioner, learned A.G.P. for respondent-State and learned advocate for respondent No. 6. Perused the memo of the writ petition, annexures thereto and affidavit-in-reply filed by the respondents.

3. Two grounds are pressed into service by the learned advocate for the petitioners. First is that, the objections raised by the petitioners for formation of ward were not considered by the respondents, secondly, the notification is not in accordance with clause No.4.6.2 of the Government Resolution dated 17.01.2023.

4. So far as first contention of the petitioner is concerned, in the affidavit in reply, respondents have averred that ward formation was conducted and completed by following the prescribed procedure. Subsequently, draft of the ward formation was published and vide notice dated 07.04.2026 objections were called till 13.04.2026. In order to give wide publicity draft of ward formation was affixed on the notice board of the village panchayat office of village Yevati. Thereafter, representative of villagers including the present petitioners filed their objections against the said draft before Tahsildar, Mukhed. Tahsildar, Mukhed issued notice for providing opportunity of hearing to the concerned and asked them to submit their oral/written argument with cogent evidence. Accordingly, on 21.04.2026 Tahsildar, Mukhed conducted hearing. All the applicants were remained present for hearing except Petitioner No. 1. Thereafter, the Committee constituted for ward formation submitted its opinion on the said objections. Taking into consideration the record and relevant laws, Tahsildar, Mukhed

rejected the objections being devoid of merit. Subsequently, Sub Divisional Officer, Degloor rejected said objections on merit vide its letter dated 21.04.2026. Said decision of the Sub Divisional Officer was confirmed by the Collector, Nanded. Therefore, first objection of the petitioners that their objections were not considered by the respondents is unsustainable.

5. In respect of second objection, the respondents have specifically averred that after rejecting all the objections on merits final ward formation (Form-A) was published on 05.05.2026. They have placed on record Schedule 9 comprising details of final ward formation. It is specifically averred by the respondents that the ward formation was done strictly in accordance with the Government Resolution dated 17.02.2026.

6. The petitioners are not in a position to controvert these statements.

7. In light of the above, we find no merit in this writ petition. Writ petition is therefore dismissed.

(ABASAHEB D. SHINDE, J.) (NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.)

Bhagyawant Punde