

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

REVIEW APPLICATION NO.24 OF 2016
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.10320 OF 2014

NETAJI RANGNATH SURYAWANSHI

APPLICANT

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

RESPONDENTS

Mr.B.M.Dhanure, Advocate for the applicant.
Mrs.S.S.Raut, AGP for respondent Nos. 1 to 5.
Mr.M.C.Swami, Advocate for respondent No.6.
Mr.N.L.Jadhav, Advocate for respondent No.7.

(CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

DATE : 29/04/2016

PER COURT :

1. Notice was issued in this review application on 01/02/2016 after considering the submissions of the applicant which are recorded as under :-

"1. The Grievance of the applicant is that though Tanaji Rangnath Patil, Chief Promoter of Gajanan Matsyavyavsai Sahakari Sanstha Ltd.,/respondent no.6 in the petition had passed away on 16/08/2013, the petitioner arrived at the compromise Exh."X" wherein Netaji Rangnath Suryawanshi claimed to represent respondent No.6. Such a fraud has been played by the petitioner and respondent No.6 in the writ petition. He, therefore, prays for reviewing the said order and

for restoration of the petition.

2. Issue notice before admission to the respondents, returnable on 22/02/2016. Learned AGP waives service for respondent Nos. 1 to 5. Mr.Swami, learned Advocate appears on behalf of respondent Nos. 6 and 7.

3. Till the next date of hearing in the matter, the respondents/ Statutory Authorities shall not initiate steps in pursuance to the compromise Exh."X".

4. It is made clear to the applicant Netaji Rangnath Suryawanshi that if his allegations in the review application turn out to be false, this application would be dismissed with costs of Rs.50,000/- to be recovered from the applicant.

5. All office objections shall be removed by the review-applicant on or before 12/02/2016."

2. Learned Advocate for the applicant submits on instructions that the applicant desires to withdraw this review application. Mr.Jadhav, learned Advocate appearing on behalf of respondent No,7 submits that he has no objection for the simplicitor withdrawal of this civil application.

3. In the light of the above, I am not imposing costs since the

applicant desires to withdraw this application. Review application is, therefore, dismissed, as withdrawn.

4. Pending civil application, does not survive and hence is disposed of.

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)