

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

Civil Application (CAO) No. 1100 of 2013

in

Misc. Civil Application St. No. 13148 of 2013

in

Civil Application (CAO) No. 735 of 2013 (D)

in

Misc. Civil Application No. 345 of 2013 (D)

in

WRIT PETITION NO. 5730 of 2012 (D)

(Dr. Shivkumar Dindayal Chauhan Vs. The State of Mah. Through its Secretary
to the Social Welfare Dept. and ors.)

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

Court's or Judge's order

None for applicant/petitioner

Shri C. N. Adgokar, AGP for the respondents

CORAM

: B.P.DHARMADHIKARI &
A B. CHAUDHARI, JJ.

DATE

: FEBRUARY 13, 2015.

Nobody for review applicant even today.

There was no appearance on 30-1-2015. The prayer in miscellaneous civil application is to review the decision dated 21-6-2013 in Civil Application (CAO) No. 735/2013. By said decision, this Court has found that Civil Application (CAO) No. 735/2013 was moved for

.....2/-

setting aside the order dated 22-4-2013 disposing of earlier Miscellaneous Civil Application No. 345/2013. There was also a prayer in that miscellaneous civil application to set aside the order dated 18-3-2013 in Writ Petition No. 5730/2012.

The observations made by this Court in its order dated 21-6-2013 relevant for present purpose and are as under :

On 18.3.2013 W.P. No. 5730/12 was argued on behalf of the petitioner by Advocate N.C. Phadnis. He was assisted by Advocate D.L. Chauhan. Present C.A.O. No. 735/13 is filed by said Advocate Chauhan, who claims to be the father of petitioner.

On 18.3.2013 the only grievance made was about non-return of two original documents by the Scrutiny Committee. This Court has looked into that controversy and found no substance in that contention. Accordingly, the application was rejected by reasoned order. Its review has again been rejected on 22.4.2013. Therefore, this second application styled as application for speaking to minutes is not only misconceived but also not tenable. Same is rejected.

This Court has, therefore, not accepted the story of petitioner that he did not retain copies of important documents having bearing of caste claim.

The petitioner after rejection of writ petition, on 18-3-2013, has filed this second application for very same purpose. We, therefore, find it unsustainable. It is, therefore, dismissed with costs of Rs. 2,000/- (Rupees Two Thousand Only) payable to the High Court Legal Services Sub-Committee, Nagpur.

JUDGE

JUDGE

wasnik

...../-