

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

C.A.W. NO.659/2015
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.6577/2013

G.T. Industries Ltd.

..Versus..

State of Maharashtra, through Principal Secretary, Rural Development, Mantralaya,
Mumbai and others

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

CORAM : Z.A. HAQ, J.

DATE : 15.4.2015

Shri S.M. Patrikar, the learned advocate for the petitioner points out the affidavit dated 10th April, 2015 filed on behalf of the petitioner in which it is stated that the petitioner has complied with the order passed by this Court. The learned advocate submits that in view of the above, the civil application does not survive. It is disposed of accordingly.

C.A.W. NO.462/2015.

The respondent no.3/Grampanchayat has filed this

application seeking permission to encash the bank guarantee furnished by the petitioner on 25th June, 2014 on the ground that the petitioner has not paid the arrears of taxes. In the affidavit dated 10th April, 2015 filed on behalf of the petitioner, it is stated that the petitioner has paid the amount of Rs.6,64,870/- towards the taxes for the year 2014 - 2015 and has furnished bank guarantee of Rs.45,60,471/- for the arrears of taxes as per the order passed by this Court on 25th June, 2014. After considering the facts on the record, I am satisfied that the petitioner has complied with the order passed by this Court on 25th June, 2014 and the prayer as made by the respondent no.3 for encashing the bank guarantee cannot be granted. The further prayers made in the application also do not require any consideration in view of the above mentioned facts. The civil application is dismissed.

C.A.W. NO.563/2015.

Considering the pendency of petitions of earlier years and the fact that the petitioner has not been able to point out any urgency, the prayer for early hearing is rejected. The civil application is dismissed.

C.A.W. NO.564/2015.

This application is filed by the petitioner praying that the matter be remanded to the respondent no.4. The learned advocate for the respondent no.3/contesting party opposes the prayer made in the application. The prayer as made on behalf of the applicant/petitioner cannot be granted without considering the merits of the matter. The civil application is dismissed.

JUDGE

Tambaskar.