

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 839 OF 2013

Sandip Gopalrao Deshpande .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others .. Respondents

Shri Amit A. Mukhedkar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Shri V. D. Rakh, A.G.P. for the Respondent No. 1.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
A. M. BADAR, JJ.**

DATE : 04TH JANUARY, 2016.

PER COURT :

. We have heard Mr. Mukhedkar, the learned counsel for the petitioner. The learned counsel submits that, the petitioner has a strong belief that, the Electronic Voting Machine (E.V.M.) is faulty and it is required to be referred to the expert for its opinion.

2. There is no basis for the said belief made out in the petition. Only because petitioner believes something, the same can not be sufficient to invoke the writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

3. In light of that, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

4. The petitioner may agitate the grounds as agitated in the present petition, in case, the same is permissible before any other authority.

[A. M. BADAR, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

bsb/Jan. 16