

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

39 WRIT PETITION NO. 11142 OF 2015

RAMESH NAMDEO PATIL AND OTHERS  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Patil Paresh B.  
AGP for Respondents: S.S. Raut  
Advocate for Respondents : B B Yenge For R/1 & 2

...

**CORAM : S.V.GANGAPURWALA &  
P.R. BORA, JJ.  
DATED : 10.10.2016.**

**P.C. :-**

1. Mr. Patil, the learned counsel for the petitioners states that, the petitioners had borrowed loan from the respondent no.2-Maharashtra State O.B.C. Development Corporation. The petitioners belong to O.B.C. category. The learned counsel submits that, vide government resolution dated 25.08.2009, the scheme of remission of loan was introduced. The same is applicable to respondent no.2-corporation also. The learned counsel submits that, the petitioners loan amount are squarely covered under the debt relief scheme. The government i.e. respondent no.1 remitted the loan amount to respondent no.2. The loan due on

01.04.2008 is made nil but still the outstanding amount is shown as against the petitioners, the same is illegal.

2. Mr. Yenge, the learned advocate for respondent no2 states that, all the petitioners are given benefit of the debt waiver scheme as applicable vide government resolution dated 25.08.2008 and 22.08.2009. The learned counsel submits that, the details are given of the amount of the debt waiver given to the petitioners and the amount outstanding after giving the benefit of debt waiver.

3. We have considered the submissions. Along with the affidavit in reply, respondent no.2 has placed on record the chart showing the amount of loan disbursement to the petitioners. The amount re-paid by the petitioners and the benefit of the debt waiver scheme given to the petitioner, so also the amount outstanding after giving the benefit of the amount under the debt waiver scheme.

4. According to the petitioners, the calculations made are improper. This court in its writ jurisdiction would not embark upon the investigation of the said disputed questions of fact. Suffice it to state that, the petitioners have been accorded the benefit of the debt waiver scheme as is explicitly clear from the chart produced along with the

affidavit in reply.

5. In case the petitioners have some grievance with regard to the calculations made, the petitioners may approach the respondent no.2 in that regard and put forth their calculations. The respondent no.2 certainly would consider the same and take appropriate decision upon it. Writ petition accordingly disposed of. No costs.

**[P.R.BORA, J.]**

**[S.V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]**