

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.11789/2016

IN

WRIT PETITION NO.1223/2015

Raju S/o Vaijnath Mankar & others.

...Applicants..

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & others.

..Non-Applicants.

Respondents..

.....

Shri P.P.Komple, Advocate for Applicants.

Shri S.B.Pulkundwar, Advocate for Non-Applicant /
Respondent Nos.2 & 3.

Shri V.S.Badak, AGP for the State.

.....

**CORAM: S.V. GANGAPURWALA &
K.L. WADANE, JJ.**

DATE: 30.09.2016

ORDER :

1] Issue notice to non-applicants / respondents.

2] Learned AGP appears for the respondent no.1 and Shri Pulkundwar, learned counsel appears for the respondent nos.2 & 3.

3] Learned counsel for the applicants states that on 8.12.2015, when the matter was on the Board, he could not

- 2 -

remain present as he was not feeling well.

4] Learned counsel for the respondent nos.2 & 3 opposes the request for restoration.

5] We have heard the learned counsel for the non-applicants / respondents.

6] Considering the reasons given for the absence of the learned Advocate for the applicants / original petitioners, the application is allowed. The writ petition is restored.

(K.L. WADANE, J.) (S.V. GANGAPURWALA, J.)