IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 5245 OF 2026

Jaykar Dinkar Jadhav … Petitioner

Vs.

The State Of Maharashtra Thr. Honble Minister Of Urban Development And Ors. … Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 5246 OF 2026

Jaykar Dinkar Jadhav … Petitioner

Vs.

The State Of Maharashtra Thr. Honble Minister Of Urban Development And Ors. … Respondents

.....

- Mr. Umesh Pawar, for the Petitioner in both Petitions.
- Mr. Sanjay D. Rayrikar, AGP, for the Respondent – State in WP/5245/2026.
- Mr. J. P. Patil, AGP, for the Respondent – State in WP/5246/2026.
- Mr. Rupesh K. Bobade, for the Respondent No.4 in WP/5245/2026 and WP/5246/2026.
- Mr. A. M. Kulkarni (Through VC) a/w Mr. Akshay A. Kulkarni and Mr. Avesh A. Ghadge, for Respondent No.5.

.....

CORAM : SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.

DATE : 30th OCTOBER, 2026.

SHANTANU SHANKARSA DHUDUM
Digitally signed by SHANTANU SHANKARSA DHUDUM
Date: 2026.11.02 10:21:09 +0530

P. C. :

. Heard learned Advocates appearing for the parties.

2. Both Petitions are directed against the interlocutory orders granting suspension to the orders dated 10/07/2026 and 13/07/2026 passed by learned Collector, disqualifying the Respondent No.5.

3. The grievance of the Petitioners is that both the impugned orders are unreasoned and have been passed in a clandestine manner. The allegations against Respondent No. 5, on the basis of which he has been disqualified, are serious in nature. However, the impugned orders have been passed in a casual manner.

4. On 13/10/2026, learned AGP was directed to take instruction from the concerned learned Minister as to how much time would be required for deciding the Interim Application of Revision.

5. Today, learned AGP tenders on record written instructions addressed by the Additional Secretary, Government of Maharashtra, stating that the matters were listed yesterday for final hearing; however, due to unavoidable circumstances, they were adjourned and the next date of hearing would be communicated to the parties.

6. Learned counsel for the Petitioners has demonstrated before this Court that, prior to passing the impugned order, it was communicated

that the hearing had been adjourned. However, surprisingly, on the very same day, the impugned order granting stay was passed. Thereafter, by notice dated 25/08/2026, the parties were informed that the matter would be heard on 02/09/2026. The hearing was further adjourned, by notice dated 21/10/2026, to 28/10/2026. Again, by notice dated 27/10/2026, it was adjourned to 29/10/2026.

7. The learned AGP now informs this Court that the hearing scheduled yesterday has been adjourned to a future date. He also seeks four weeks' time to conclude the proceedings. In the ordinary course, the time sought would have been granted by this Court.

8. However, the manner in which the proceedings are being conducted before the learned Minister is objectionable. Prima facie, the impugned orders are devoid of reasons. It is not pointed out that any reasoned order has been passed suspending the orders of disqualification. The suspension continues to operate, whereas the final hearing is being adjourned.

9. As a last indulgence, this Court grants two weeks' time to finally decide the proceedings. The suspension shall remain in operation only until then and shall expire thereafter without any further reference to this Court.

10. Both the Writ Petitions are disposed of with a direction that the suspension granted by the impugned orders shall remain in operation for two weeks only and shall stand vacated thereafter, without reference to this Court and without any further extension by the Appellate Authority.

11. It shall be open to the Appellate Authority to conclude the proceedings within two weeks, after extending an opportunity of hearing to the Petitioners.

12. Both Writ Petitions are disposed of accordingly.

(SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.)