

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 2933 OF 2015

Shamrao Bhimrao Landge .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others .. Respondents

Shri Girish B. Kulkarni, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Shri B. V. Virdhe, A.G.P. for Respondent Nos. 1 to 4.

Shri M. S. Adate, Advocate h/f Shri S. S. Tope, Advocate for
Respondent Nos. 5 and 6.

Shri S. V. Deshmukh, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 7 and 8.

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

DATE : 11TH JULY, 2016.

PER COURT :

. Mr. Kulkarni, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, though drought situation existed in the village, the respondent No. 8/Gram Panchayat was supplying water to the respondent No. 9/industry. The water is required to be supplied basically for drinking and agricultural purposes.

2. Mr. Deshmukh, the learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos. 7 and 8 submits that, at present because of the pendency of present petition the Gram Panchayat had stopped supply of water to the respondent No. 9/industry. The Gram

Panchayat was supplying only surplus water, after supplying it for drinking and agricultural purposes.

3. Today, with the passage of time, the drought situation does not exist. Naturally preference would be given for supply of drinking water to the villagers. However, if there is surplus water, there would be no impediment for the Gram Panchayat to supply the water to the industry.

4. Considering the above, at present drought situation does not exist, the writ petition stands disposed of. No costs.

5. In case fresh eventuality arises, aggrieved party may resort to appropriate proceedings.

[K. K. SONAWANE, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]