

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD
WRIT PETITION NO. 10193 OF 2013

ADINATH SHANKARAPPA GAURSHETTE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. E.P. Sawant.
AGP for Respondents: Mr. N.B. Patil.

CORAM : S.V. GANGAPURWALA
& K.K. SONAWANE, JJ.
DATE : 12TH JULY , 2016.

PER COURT:

1] Mr. Salunke, learned counsel for respondent No.4 submits that after the report is received subsequently the APMC has passed a resolution, thereby deciding not to take any action. Petitioners have a remedy under the Maharashtra Agricultural Produce (Marketing and Development) Act, 1963 to challenge the same under Section 41A or 52B of the said Act.

2] Mr. Sawant, learned counsel for the petitioner states that the said resolution is passed during the pendency of the writ petition. Be that as it may, as the petitioner has a forum to assail the said resolution, we would relegate the petitioner to avail the said alternate remedy. In the light of above, writ petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to avail the alternate remedy. All contentions of the respective parties are kept open.

[K.K. SONAWANE]
JUDGE

[S.V. GANGAPURWALA]
JUDGE.

grt/-