

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 11956 OF 2025

Dnyaneshwar Dhondibhau Maskare ... Petitioner
versus
State of Maharashtra & Ors. ... Respondents

**AND (NOT ON BOARD)
WRIT PETITION NO. 11874 OF 2025**

Shyam Vasant Mali ... Petitioner
versus
State of Maharashtra & Ors. ... Respondents

...

Mr.Sumit Kothari with Ms.Niharika Chandurkar for the Petitioners in both the Petitions.
Mr.P.P.Kakade, Addl.GP with Mrs.P.N.Diwan, AGP for the Respondent - State in WP No. 11956 of 2025.
Mr.S.V.Gavand with Mrs.P.H.Gaikwad Patil for Respondent No.2- Zilla Parishad, Pune.
Mr.O.A.Chandurkar, Addl.GP with Mrs.P.N.Diwan, AGP for the Respondent -State in WP No. 11874 of 2025.

...

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
HITEN S.VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATE : APRIL 16, 2026

P.C:

1. Writ Petition No. 11874 of 2025 is not on board. On the request of the learned Advocate for the Petitioner, taken on board.

2. In these Petitions, the Petitioners seek to challenge Rule XII of the Maharashtra Zilla Parishads and Panchayat Samitis (Manner and Rotation of Reservation of Seats) Rules, 2025 (the Rules, 2025).

3. The learned Addl.GPs submit that the First Court (Coram:Shree Chandrashekhar, CJ & Gautam A. Ankhad, J.) delivered a *judgment on 13.02.2026 in Writ Petition No. 11878 of 2025 and connected Petitions (Vikram Kashinathrao Khutwad versus The State of Maharashtra & Ors.)*, whereby this Court has concluded that the challenge to Rule XII of the Rules, 2025 has no foundation in law. Paragraph 45 of the said judgment reads as under:

‘45. In the aforementioned background, it is established with an ample measure that the challenge made by the petitioners to Rule XII of the Rotation of Reservation Rules, 2025 has no foundation in law. Holding of elections for the Zilla Parishads, Panchayat Samitis etc. is necessary for effectuating the objective of self-governance. The individual's right to franchise and right to contest the elections are not unfettered rights and are regulated under the statutory provisions.’

4. In view of the above, **these Writ Petitions are dismissed.**

(HITEN S.VENEGAVKAR, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)