

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD.

Office Memoranda of appearance, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders.	Notes, of Court's orders or Registrar's orders.	Office Coram, Court's orders or Registrar's orders.	Court's or Judge's orders.
--	---	---	----------------------------

REVIEW APPLICATION NO.: 47 OF 2015
IN

WRIT PETITION NO.: 10690 OF 2010

PRABHAKAR WS/O KERBA BICHAKATE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHRASHTRA AND OTHERS

Advocate for the Petitioner: Mr. S. B. Talekar.

AGP for the Respondent No.1, 4 and 5: Mr. S. D. Kaldate.

**CORAM: T. V. NALAWADE &
INDIRA K. JAIN, JJ.**
DATED: 7th MARCH, 2016.

PER COURT:

1. The application is filed for review of judgment and order of writ petition No.10690 of 2010 decided by this Court by the decision dated 19th March, 2015. Heard learned counsel for the Review Applicant, original petitioner.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner, present applicant argued on following few points:

- (i) Village Yekamba, the native place of the petitioner, was part of erstwhile Hyderabad State and during reorganization of the States it

became part of Karnataka State and some area came to Maharashtra State.

(ii) Dhangar caste is stated as O.B.C. in both Karnataka State and Maharashtra State.

(iii) That the Maharashtra State has made a claim that 865 villages of Karnataka State need to be included in Maharashtra State, including village Yekamba.

3. To get decision on the basis of aforesaid two points, learned counsel for the Review Applicant placed reliance on the case reported as "**2013 (1) Bom.C.R. 716 (Preeti Gopalrao Kamble V/s State of Maharashtra and others)**" and subsequent case decided by other Division Bench of this Court in which the aforesaid case of this Bench was followed.

4. This Court has considered the relevant facts of the present matter and on the basis of the cases of Supreme Court, which are mentioned in para 11 of the judgment, this Court has decided the matter. The aforesaid submissions were considered by this Court while deciding the present matter and it cannot be said that the aforesaid circumstances like village Yekamba was part of erstwhile

Hyderabad State and some part has come to the Maharashtra State and some part has gone to karnataka State was not considered. In view of these circumstances, it cannot be said that there is something new on the basis of which this Court needs to consider the matter again. Review application stands rejected.

(INDIRA K. JAIN, J.) (T. V. NALAWADE, J.)

Dt.07/03/2016.

ans/47