

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

M.C.A.NO. 1006/2015 IN W.P.NO. 3383/2015.

Dr. Ashok Shankarrao Adhao.

-VERSUS-

Union of India and others.

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

Court's or Judge's Orders

**CORAM : B.P.DHARMADHIKARI
& P.N. DESHMUKH, JJ.**

DATE : OCTOBER 05, 2015.

Heard Shri Anand Parchure, learned counsel for the petitioner/applicant, Shri C.S. Kaptan, learned Senior Counsel with Shri Chitley, learned Counsel for respondent no.3, Shri R.Deo, learned ASGI for respondent no.1, Shri V.V. Bhangde, learned Counsel for respondent no.8 and Shri N.R. Patil, learned A.G.P. for respondent no.2.

2. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that inadvertently on 14.09.2015, the fact that there are total 5 representatives from State of Maharashtra on

2

respondent no.8 Council, could not be pointed out. He submits that when there are 4 other representatives to cater to the interest of the medical practitioner in State of Maharashtra, restraining the respondent no.3 from functioning as member on respondent no.8 cannot adversely affect anybody.

3. Respective counsel dispute the facts. According to them, only one representative from State of Maharashtra is responsible to look after the interest of medical practitioners. They wish to place on record the breakup to point out the status of other representatives and the constituency which they represent.

4. We do not wish to go into these niceties. If there are total 5 persons, as urged by the petitioner, it is apparent that the collective decision is to be reached by all 5 and individual role of the returned candidate by itself cannot be decisive. We therefore, find no need and no ground for review. The application is, therefore, rejected. No costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Rgd.