

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 6984 OF 2016

Sharada Raichury Rangdas ... Petitioner
Vs.
Vijay Asaram Baldawa and Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. S.V. Adwant, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. A.P. Basarkar, AGP for respondent-state.

CORAM : SUNIL P. DESHMUKH, J.
DATE : 02-08-2016.

Per Court :

1. Looking at the nature of orders passed, it appears that the petitioner may have an alternate efficacious remedy available as can be gathered from the provisions of Maharashtra Land Revenue Code.

2. Learned counsel purports to contend that an appeal would not be maintainable, and for said purpose he has canvassed certain submissions as have been contained in the written submissions as also a couple of orders passed by this court wherein the common undercurrent appears to running that if not an appeal at least a revision is maintainable. While the undercurrent may ostensibly appear to be so, may be that, the purport underlying the provisions contained under section 247 of Maharashtra Land Revenue Code, had not been drawn attention to and had not been

fallen for consideration.

3. In any case, since an alternate remedy is available, the writ petition is not being entertained and is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to prosecute alternate remedy as may be considered to be available. Needless to refer to that, the period consumed during the pendency of this writ petition would be appropriately considered if it comes to condonation of delay in the proceedings as may be resorted to by the petitioner.

(SUNIL P. DESHMUKH)
JUDGE

mub