

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

CIVIL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 31 OF 2016

MR. FARID VELJEE.

... Petitioner

Versus

THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF
PANAJI, THR. ITS DEPUTY
COMMISSIONER AND 2 ORS.

... Respondents

Petitioner present along with Mr. J. P. Mulgaonkar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. A. D. Bhobe, Advocate for the respondent no.1.

The power of attorney of respondent no.2 present in person.

Coram:- F. M. REIS, J.

Date:- 7th December, 2016

P.C.

Heard Mr. J. P. Mulgaonkar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, Mr. A. D. Bhobe, learned counsel appearing for the respondent no.1 and the power of attorney of the respondent no.2 present in person.

2. At the instance of Mr. Mulgaonkar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, the power of attorney of the respondent no.2 present in Court.

3. After hearing the matter for sometime, Mr. J. P. Mulgaonkar, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner upon instructions seeks leave to withdraw the above Writ Petition as

the petitioner has availed of an alternate remedy by challenging the impugned order of the Dy. Commissioner before the Appellate Authority. Mr. Mulgaonkar, learned counsel however points out that the findings in the impugned order passed by the learned District Judge should not come in the way of challenge put forward by the petitioner before the Appellate Authority. The findings are in the context of deciding the petition in terms of Section 256 of the City of Panaji Corporation Act and consequently, the alternate remedy availed by the petitioner would have to be examined on its own merits in accordance with law. The petition is accordingly dismissed as withdrawn.

F. M. REIS, J.

at*