

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 5376 OF 2013

Shakur Masjid Saudagar and others .. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others .. Respondents

Shri Anil H. Kasliwal, Advocate for Petitioners.

Shri A. P. Basarkar, A.G.P. for Respondent Nos. 1 to 4.

Shri S. S. Choudhari, Advocate for the Respondent No. 5.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
A. M. BADAR, JJ.**

DATE : 25TH FEBRUARY, 2016.

PER COURT :

. In fact the petition is filed only on apprehension. According to Mr. Kasliwal, the learned counsel, some villagers have filed representations demanding closure of the petitioners' shop which is being run under CL-III license. The learned counsel submits that, representations are given to the Authority and if, any action is to be taken, the petitioners should be first heard. The learned counsel relies on the judgment of the learned Single Judge of this Court delivered at Nagpur Bench in Writ Petition No. 1824 of 2014 dated 27th July, 2015 and the Circular dated 07th September, 1994.

2. We have heard the learned Assistant Government Pleader also.

3. The learned A. G. P. states that the Authority would follow the provisions of law before taking any action.

4. In case, the Authority wants to take any action for closure of the shop of petitioners, then only petitioners would be entitled for the show cause notice and the reply of petitioners will have to be called and considered by the Authority.

5. With these observations, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

[A. M. BADAR, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]