IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 4460 OF 2013

VEERSHYAWA MAHILA BACHAT GAT, WANEWADI
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS
...
Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Amol Chalak, Advocate h/f Mr. S. B. Talekar.
AGP for Respondent Nos.1 to 3 : Mr. V.H. Dighe.
. . .

CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
A. M. BADAR, JJ.

DATE : 1st March, 2016.

PER COURT:

1] Mr. Chalak, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that initially, when the assessment was done, the Committee consisting of the District Supply Officer, Project Director and District Coordinator had ranked the petitioner as number 1 and respondent No.4 as number 2. However, by overwriting, the same is changed. The District Supply Officer has not considered this aspect while dismissing the claim of the petitioner.

2] Learned AGP states that the petitioner has an alternate remedy available.

3] In view of the fact that as per the respondents, petitioner has an alternate remedy, we are not entering into the merits of the contentions. Writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to avail alternate remedy. All contentions are kept open. The forum where the proceeding would be filed, shall consider the time span spent in prosecuting the present writ petition. No costs.

[A.M. BADAR]
JUDGE

[S.V. GANGAPURWALA]
JUDGE

grt/-