

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 8105 OF 2014

Balu Vitthal Waghmare. ..Petitioner.

Versus

Central Council of Indian Medicine
and Others. ..Respondents.

AND

WRIT PETITION NO. 8106 OF 2014

Sanjivani Manik Jadhav ..Petitioner.

Versus

Central Council of Indian Medicine
and Others. ..Respondents.

AND

WRIT PETITION NO. 8101 OF 2014

Sheetal Umesh Patil ..Petitioner.

Versus

Central Council of Indian Medicine
and Others. ..Respondents.

AND

WRIT PETITION NO. 8107 OF 2014

Rajesh Pundlik Koli ..Petitioner.

Versus

Central Council of Indian Medicine
and Others. ..Respondents.

AND

WRIT PETITION NO. 8109 OF 2014

Prashant Annaso Bhapkar ..Petitioner.

Versus

Central Council of Indian Medicine
and Others. ..Respondents.

AND

WRIT PETITION NO. 8110 OF 2014

Yogesh Shrikant Mahadik ..Petitioner.

Versus

Central Council of Indian Medicine
and Others. ..Respondents.

AND
WRIT PETITION NO. 8100 OF 2014

Ravindra Narayan Koli ..Petitioner.

Versus

Central Council of Indian Medicine
and Others. ..Respondents.

AND
WRIT PETITION NO. 8103 OF 2014

Ravindra Subhash Shishte ..Petitioner.

Versus

Central Council of Indian Medicine
and Others. ..Respondents.

AND
WRIT PETITION NO. 5231 OF 2014

Annaso Dadaso Birmale ..Petitioner.

Versus

Central Council of Indian Medicine
and Others. ..Respondents.

AND
WRIT PETITION NO. 11399 OF 2014

Bahubali Jinnappa Kempwade ..Petitioner.

Versus

Central Council of Indian Medicine
and Others. ..Respondents.

Mr. Vijay Killedear for the Petitioner.
Mr. Mohd. Asadullah Bhaikh i/b Y. K. Singh for Respondent No.1.
Mr. U. V. Warunjikar for Respondent Nos. 6 & 7.
Mr. V. M. Sagare, AGP for the State.

Coram : Ranjit More &
Dr.(Smt) S. S. Phansalkar-Joshi, JJ.
Date : **March 8, 2016.**

P. C. :

1. Having heard learned Counsel appearing for the respective parties, we find that the Petitioners have an

alternate and efficacious remedy of appeal which will lie before the Grievances Committee constituted under section 53 of the Maharashtra University of Health Sciences Act, 1998. In that view of the matter, we are not inclined to entertain these writ petitions and exercise our writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Resultantly, writ petitions are dismissed.

2. If any appeal as contemplated under section 53 of the said Act is filed, the Grievances Committee shall deal with the same and decide it as expeditiously as possible and preferably within the period of 6 months of its filing. We clarify that we have not expressed any opinion on the rival contentions and the pleas raised in the petitions and they are kept open to be canvassed before the Grievances Committee.

[Dr. (Smt.) S. S. Phansalkar-Joshi, J.]

[RANJIT MORE, J.]