

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO.111 OF 2016

Samarth Krida va Sanskrutik Mandal	..Petitioner
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra	..Respondent
with	

WRIT PETITION NO.90 OF 2016

Vakratunda Kala Krida va Sanskrutik Mandal	..Petitioner
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra	..Respondent
with	

WRIT PETITION NO.91 OF 2016

Wagt Kala Krida Sanskrutik Mandal	..Petitioner
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra	..Respondent
with	

WRIT PETITION NO.3527 OF 2015

Jolly Social Club Sawantwadi	..Petitioner
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra	..Respondent
with	

WRIT PETITION NO.4381 OF 2015

Shree Mateshwar Kala Krida va Sanskrutik Mandal	..Petitioner
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra	..Respondent
with	

WRIT PETITION NO.4575 OF 2015

Dhanashri Kala Krida va Sanskrutik Mandal	..Petitioner
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra	..Respondent
with	

WRIT PETITION NO.4576 OF 2015

Bramhand Kala Krida va Sanskrutik Mandal	..Petitioner
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra	..Respondent

with
WRIT PETITION NO.4577 OF 2015

Jay Malhar Kala Krida va Sanskrutik Mandal	..Petitioner
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra	..Respondent

with
WRIT PETITION NO.4932 OF 2015

Vijeta Kala Krida Sanskrutik Vs Manoranjan Mandal	..Petitioner
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra	..Respondent

with
WRIT PETITION NO.4937 OF 2015

Chandrachaya Kala Krida va Sanskrutik Mandal	..Petitioner
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra	..Respondent

with
WRIT PETITION NO.4938 OF 2015

Bhuvaneshwari Kala Krida Va Sanskrutik Mandal	..Petitioner
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra	..Respondent

Mr. Manoj A. Patil, advocate for the petitioner in all the petitions.
Mr. S. K.Shinde, PP along with Mrs. S.V. Sonawane, APP for the State in writ petition Nos.111/2016, 90/16, 91/16,3527/16, 4381/15, 4937/15 and 4938/15.
Mr. S. K. Shinde, PP along with Mr. K. V. Saste, APP for the State in writ petition Nos. 4575/15 to 4577/15 and writ petition No.4932/15

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
V. L. ACHLIYA, JJ.**

DATE : 1st MARCH, 2016.

P. C. :

1 These are the petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, by which the petitioner prays for issuance

of writ of mandamus directing the respondents not to enter the premises of the petitioner society/mandal/trust, without following the procedure prescribed by law.

2 The learned APP states, on instructions, that the authorities have always followed the procedure, and the petitioner has not complained of any breach of the procedure followed by the respondents.

3 The learned APP, however, states that whenever an occasion would arise to effect entry in the premises of the petitioner society/mandal/trust, the respondents would obviously follow the procedure established by law.

4 We accept the aforesaid statement as an undertaking to the Court.

5 The learned counsel for the petitioners, therefore, states that the petitioners may be permitted to withdraw these petitions, as this Court has accepted the statement made by the learned APP as an undertaking to the Court.

6 The writ petitions are, accordingly, dismissed as withdrawn accepting the statement made by the learned APP as an undertaking to the Court.

[V. L. ACHLIYA, J.]

[RANJIT MORE, J.]