

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

Civil Application No. 7117 of 2011

(In Review Application Stamp No. 11233 / 2011)

(In Writ Petition No. 2900 of 2004)

Smt. Saraswati d/o. Ramchandra Sonwane,

Age ; 46 years,

Occupation : Service,

presently working as Junior Clerk

in Tahsil Office, Jawli,

District : Satara,

R/o. Samadhan Building,

Balaji Peth, Jalgaon.

.. Applicant.

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through its Secretary,
Revenue Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai.

2. The Committee for Scrutiny and
Verification of Tribe Claims,
Nashik.

3. The Collector, Satara,
District ; Satara.

.. Respondents.

.....

*Mr. Kalyan Patil, Advocate, holding for
Mr. S.R. Barlinge, Advocate, for the applicant.*

*Mrs. M.B. Gangwal (Patni), Assistant Government Pleader,
for respondent nos.1 and 3.*

Mr. P.S. Patil, Advocate, for respondent no.2.

.....

**CORAM : A.V. NIRGUDE &
A.M. BADAR, JJ.**

DATE : 8TH JULY 2015

PER COURT :

1. Heard learned Counsel for respective parties.
2. By the present application, the applicant seeks condonation of delay of 689 days caused in filing Review Application seeking review of the order dated 7th May 2009, passed by this Court, in Writ Petition No. 2900 of 2004.
3. The reason given by the applicant for seeking condonation of delay is, want of information about the judgment under review. The judgment under review was delivered in presence of the learned Counsel for the applicant, on 7th May 2009. The applicant, therefore, cannot simply say that she did not know about this judgment, unless she alleges that her Advocate did not intimate to her, the outcome of the petition. Instead, the applicant stated that her Advocate had sent a letter to her on her previous address which she had, in the meantime, changed. We are not convinced that this would happen. The applicant cannot vouch for the fact that her Advocate sent a letter to her on her previous address. Therefore, we are not inclined to take this statement as believable. The story of change of address is also not believable because the applicant did not mention her new address even while filing this Application. She has mentioned the old address in the present Application also. Hence, the

Application deserves to be rejected.

4. In the result, the Civil Application is rejected.

(A.M. BADAR)
JUDGE

(A.V. NIRGUDE)
JUDGE

.....