



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 11048 OF 2025

Monali Rajendra Rathod Pawar

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Others

Mr. M. B. Kale h/f Mr. G. J. Pahilwan, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. S. R. Dheple, Advocate for respondent No. 4

Mr. S. B. Pulkundwar, AGP for respondent-State

**CORAM : Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi &
Hiten S. Venegavkar, JJ.**

DATE : 16th January, 2026

PER COURT :-

1. Present petition has been filed for following reliefs :

B) Issue writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ in the like nature, thereby kindly direct the respondent no. 2 to 4 to decide the representation dated 22.07.2025 filed by the petitioner.

C) Issue writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ in the like nature, thereby kindly direct to respondent Nos. 2 to 4 to release Revised Fund to carry out work of Grampanchayat under Jan Suraksha Yojana which is granted under Administrative Order 05.07.2023.

2. Present petitioner states that she is a former Chairman of Social Welfare Committee, Zilla Parishad, Chhatrapati Sambhajnagar. She had filed representation on 22.07.2025 before respondent Nos. 2 to 4 for extension of time for conducting Jan Suvidha Work and also grant fund for the revised plan.

3. Heard Mr. kale, holding for Mr. Pahilwan, learned Advocate for petitioner, Mr. Dheple, learned Advocate for respondent No. 4 and Mr. Pulkundwar, learned AGP for respondent-State

4. The first and the foremost fact to be noted is that a former Chairperson of Social Welfare Committee has no locus to seek extension of time for conducting work or to get the directions for grant of funds for the revised plan merely because some work was sanctioned and it is still incomplete. A third party cannot seek extension on this point alone. The petition deserves to be dismissed.

5. Even if, for the sake of argument, we assume that the petitioner has some locus standi then we will have to consider the facts. The respondent No. 4 appears to have issued administrative permission to the Jan Suraksha Work for Grampanchayat Kinhi, Dastakpur and Banoti, Tq. Soyagaon, Dist. Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar on 05.07.2023. By order dated 15.03.2024, the respondent No. 4 directed that the work should be completed by Grampanchayat within the stipulated period. Now, it appears that since the work has not been completed, this third party office petitioner seeks extension of time. The petitioner has not clarified as to whether she had made any inquiry with the Grampanchayats as to whether they had sought any extension of time for carrying out the

work. If we peruse the administrative sanction then it clearly states that when the works were sanctioned to the extent of Rs. 15,00,000/- for each of the said Grampanchayat for construction of the Grampanchayat building, certain conditions were imposed. By letter dated 05.07.2023, it was stated that the said work should be completed before 31.03.2024 and the responsibility of getting the work done was Sarpanch / Gramsevak / Branch Engineer / Deputy Engineer / Block Development Officer, other conditions were also imposed and one of the main condition is that if the construction caused would be more than Rs. 15,00,000/- then the Grampanchayat should bear the extra cost. Further, it appears that by order dated 15.03.2024, village Banoti was inform that the work should be done before 31.03.2024. We could find one more document dated 16.07.2025 issued by Block Development Officer (Class I) Panchayat Samiti, Soyagaon wherein till the said date, it appears that the work at Kinhi and Dastakpur was not even sanctioned which was in respect of demolishing old building. It is also then stated that the amount that has been sanctioned i.e., Rs. 15,00,000/- is not sufficient as regards work at Banoti against the same if is mentioned that the amount that was granted is less.

6. We had directed learned Advocate for respondent No. 4 to take instructions, thereupon, he is producing photocopy of documents

which is taken on record by marking Exhibit 'X'. By this letter, it was informed to Block Development Officer, Panchayatsamiti Soyagaon that the work at Kinhi and Banoti has not been started but the work at Dastakpur is in progress. Learned Advocate for respondent No. 4 places on record GR dated 16.02.2008 regarding the procedure to be adopted for the works to be sanctioned, funds to be distributed and the completion of work in respect of the Planning Department. It is specifically stated that when the amount is given from the District Annual Scheme, then the work should be done within two years. Now that two years period is over if village Kinhi and Banoti have not adhere to the conditions then the extension of time is impermissible. As regards Dastakpur is concerned, it is stated that the work is in progress. We presume that it would be taken to its logical end. Now when it is not clear whether Grampanchayat Kinhi and Banoti had approach the proper authority for extension of time or for any other alternative plan than the prayer clause cannot be granted.

7. We do not find any merit in the present petition. Hence, Petition stands dismissed.

(Hiten S. Venegavkar, J.)

(Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi, J.)

B. S. Joshi