

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

**REVIEW APPLICATION ST. NO. 29866 OF 2014  
IN  
WRIT PETITION NO. 7130 OF 2014**

Abhijeet Shankarrao Jagtap

**.. APPLICANT**

**VERSUS**

The Union of India  
& others.

**.. RESPONDENTS**

Mr. V.D. Sapkal, advocate holding for Mr. A. B. Kale, advocate for applicant.  
Mr. S.B. Deshpande, Standing Counsel for Union of India.  
Ms. Anjali Dubey (Bajpai), advocate for respondents 2 and 3.

**WITH  
REVIEW APPLICATION ST. NO. 29871 OF 2014  
IN  
WRIT PETITION NO. 7131 OF 2014**

Santosh Hanumantrao Upre

**.. APPLICANT**

**VERSUS**

The Union of India  
& others

**.. RESPONDENTS**

Mr. V. D. Sapkal, advocate holding for Mr. A. B. Kale, advocate for applicant.  
Mr. S. B. Deshpande, Standing Counsel for Union of India.  
Ms. Anjali Dubey (Bajpai), advocate for respondents 2 and 3.

**WITH  
REVIEW APPLICATION ST. NO. 29863 OF 2014  
IN  
WRIT PETITION NO.7094 OF 2014**

Sandeep Hanumantrao Upre

**.. APPLICANT**

**VERSUS**

The Union of India  
& others

**.. RESPONDENTS**

Mr. V. D. Sapkal, advocate holding for Mr. A. B. Kale, advocate for applicant.  
Mr. S. B. Deshpande, Standing Counsel for Union of India.  
Ms. Anjali Dubey (Bajpai), advocate for respondents 2 and 3.

**WITH  
REVIEW APPLICATION ST. NO. 29869 OF 2014  
IN  
WRIT PETITION NO. 7129 OF 2014**

Yuvraj Rajendra Jagtap

**.. APPLICANT**

**VERSUS**

Union of India  
& others

**.. RESPONDENTS**

Mr. V. D. Sapkal, advocate holding for Mr. A. B. Kale, advocate for applicant.  
Mr. S. B. Deshpande, Standing Counsel for Union of India.  
Ms. Anjali Dubey (Bajpai), advocate for respondents 2 and 3.

=====

**CORAM : R.M. BORDE &  
V.K. JADHAV, JJ.  
DATE : 22<sup>nd</sup> JANUARY, 2015.**

**PER COURT :**

1. Perused the order passed by this Court on 29.09.2014. In group of petitions arising out of identical set of facts, the another Division Bench of this Court while dealing with Writ Petition No. 9467/2014 and other companion matters, has taken similar view referring to the judgment of the Supreme Court in the matter of Rashmi Metaliks Ltd. V. Kolkata Metropolitan Development Authority reported in (2013) 10 SCC 95. It is also informed that in group of petitions arising out of identical set of facts, the Division Bench at Nagpur while dealing with Writ Petition No. 2812/2014 and other companion matters, has taken different view and the petitions were allowed. The decision rendered by Nagpur bench is subjected to challenge in Special Leave Petition presented to the Supreme Court.

2. In this view of the matter, appropriate course that applicants need to adopt is to avail of the alternate/appellate remedy. All the review applications are devoid of substance hence stand rejected.

**( V. K. JADHAV )**  
**JUDGE**

**( R. M. BORDE )**  
**JUDGE**

dyb