

Pankaj Vasantrai Doshi	}	Petitioner
versus		
The State of Maharashtra	}	
and Ors.	}	Respondents

Mr. Mohit Jadhav - AGP for the respondents.

DATED :- MARCH 30, 2016

1) After the petition was argued for sometime and on the attention of the petitioner's advocate being invited to pages 74 and 75 of the paper book, it is conceded that the petitioner's application was not compliant but deficient. It lacked in relevant proof, particularly of any works being carried out during the year 2014-15 and prior to the suspension of the licence. The petitioner's advocate states that since the licence was suspended, the requirement or the condition that the petitioner has proof of satisfactorily completing Government works in the preceding

three years cannot be complied with. However, there is sufficient proof to indicate that prior to the suspension, Government work was carried out and there was sufficient record in relation thereto, including the details of employees who were engaged for the work.

2) Once there is such a concession, then, the writ petition need not be kept pending. If the petitioner desires, he can make a fresh application and annex therewith all the relevant documents evidencing compliance with the terms and conditions. He can also make a request that certain conditions could not be complied with for reasons beyond the control of the petitioner and on account of the suspension. We have no doubt in our mind that if such an application is made accompanied by relevant documents, the authority will duly consider the same and pass an appropriate order in accordance with law.

3) With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition is disposed of.

(G.S.KULKARNI, J.)

(S.C.DHARMADHIKARI, J.)