Amrut

# IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

## WRIT PETITION NO.1220 OF 2026

DHARAMDAS PUSEKAR ... PETITIONER
Versus
THE BLOCK DEVELOPMENT OFFICER AND
2 ORS ... RESPONDENTS

Mr Abdul Rajak Walikar, Advocate for Petitioner.

**CORAM:- S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.**

**DATED :- 26th October, 2026**

P.C.:

1. Petitioner impugns notice dated 28.04.2026 issued by Respondent No.1-Block Development Officer-I, Salcete in Appeal No.BDOS-I/155/01/2026/1885. Learned Advocate appearing for Petitioner submits that Petitioner is a practicing Advocate and senior citizen. Respondent No.1-BDO has issued notice to Petitioner in appeal without application of mind. It is submitted that Petitioner has been added as Respondent No.8 in the appeal only because he has rendered professional service to Respondent No.3 in private dispute between parties. As such, he would not be necessary party for adjudication of appeal. He further points out that no relief is claimed against Petitioner. As such, issuance of notice is per se illegal and without application of mind.

2. Perusal of appeal memo, Petitioner is shown as Respondent No.8. Paragraph 4 of Appeal Memo states that Petitioner along with other Respondents have acted in concert with Respondent Nos.1 to 4 being part of syndicate of legal practitioners who trap gullible public/litigants to foment litigation for their professional gain without an iota of interest in assisting any Court/Authority in unraveling truth. Allegations of professional misconduct are sought to be made against Petitioner and other Advocates.

3. Prima facie, this Court finds that if there is a complaint regarding misconduct of an Advocate, the person aggrieved has remedy to approach the Bar Council under the Advocates Act. Respondent No.1 who is the Appellate Authority under Section 155 of Goa Panchayat Raj Act, 1994, cannot rule upon the allegations of misconduct against Advocate. In this backdrop, it was for Respondent No.1 to apply its mind before issuing notice to Advocates who are impleaded as parties in the appeal and particularly when no relief is claimed against them. In this backdrop, the present writ petition stands disposed of with liberty to Petitioner to approach Respondent No.1 and file appropriate representation/application to delete his name from the array of Respondents. If such application is filed, Respondent No.1 shall consider the same in light of observations made hereinabove and pass appropriate order within a period of four weeks from the date

of presentation of representation.

4. Writ Petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

**S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.**

Signed by: TARI AMRUT NAGESH
Designation: Private Secretary
Date: 26/10/2026 18:46:14