

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 2030 OF 2004

Smt. Shakuntala W/o Basavraj Gurgi .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others .. Respondents

Shri A. B. Kale, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Shri N. B. Patil, A.G.P. for the Respondent No. 1.

The Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 are served.

Shri S. S. Dande, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 4 and 5.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
K. K. SONAWANE, JJ.**

DATE : 30TH MARCH, 2016.

PER COURT :

. We have heard Mr. Kale, the learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Dande, the learned counsel for respondent Nos. 4 and 5.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is with regard to cancellation of allotment of plot No. E-17 which was allotted to the petitioner on 20th November, 1981. The same is cancelled vide order in September 2003 on the ground that development as per rules has not been made within stipulated period.

3. Mr. Kale, the learned counsel for the petitioner states that, plot No. E-17 is still vacant. In fact, the said plot is needed by the petitioner for expansion, as petitioner already holds plot No. E-18 and is running her industry on the said plot.

4. Considering the fact that, the plot has been repossessed under the panchanama and the allotment is cancelled on account of non development of said plot within stipulated period, we are not inclined to go into the said factual contentions.

5. The petitioner may approach the respondent/corporation for re-allotment of plot No. E-17, which application would be considered by the Corporation on its own merits and in accordance with its policy expeditiously and preferably within a period of six (06) months from the receipt of application. The writ petition is disposed of. Rule accordingly is discharged. No costs.

[K. K. SONAWANE, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]