

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 10299 OF 2013

Pralhad Vithalrao Zungure .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others .. Respondents

Shri Chandrakant V. Thombre, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Shri B. V. Virdhe, A.G.P. for the Respondent No. 1.

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

DATE : 26TH AUGUST, 2016.

PER COURT :

. This Court vide order dated 20th June, 2016 had observed that, the present petition is prosecuted only to the extent of prayer clause "B". Vide the said prayer clause the petitioner seeks directions against the respondent No. 1 to sanction the revised proposal dated 13.03.2012.

2. According to Mr. Thombre, the learned counsel for the petitioner, the proposal was submitted under the Bharat Nirman Programme for village Ukanda (Pithi) Gramin Pani Purvatha Yojana. Under the said scheme the amount was also sanctioned. First installment was also sanctioned by the respondent No. 2. The second installment was also sanctioned and recommendation was made to sanction third installment. The respondent authorities

without intimating the petitioner changed the site of the construction of the well. Due to change of site expenditure of said work is increased. The respondent No. 2 forwarded proposal for revised estimate. There was communication between the respondents. Abruptly notice is issued by the respondent No. 4 to the petitioner on false grounds. The learned counsel submits that, the respondent No. 1 be directed to take decision on the revised proposal submitted by the petitioner dated 13.03.2012.

3. The learned Assistant Government Pleader states that, communications are issued to the petitioner also with regard to the acts of malfeasance and misfeasance. We are not considering aspect of the liability in the present writ petition, as the writ petition is limited to the prayer clause "B".

4. As far as economic and fiscal policies are concerned, this Court certainly would not be in a position to dilate on the said aspect, as the Court is not expert in the said field. It is for the authorities on the advice of experts to take the decision in that regard. It is submitted that, the proposal is submitted in the year 2012. The respondent No. 1 may take decision on it, as per its policy, budget and considering the relevant aspects, if not already taken expeditiously. The writ petition as such is disposed of. No costs.

[K. L. WADANE, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]