

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 3184 OF 2016

Chandrakant Raghu Palwe
age 42 years, occ. Agril
r/o Yetalwadi, Tq. Ashti
Dist. Beed

.. PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Parmeshwar Bhimrao Palwe
age 40 years, occ. Agril

2. Chaturabai Bhimrao Palwe
age 56 years, occ. Agril.

Both r/o Yetalwadi, Tq. Ashti
Dist. Beed.

3. Ambadas Shevurao Vanve
age 60 years, occ. Agril
r/o Gahinath Nagar,
Post Mahakala
Tq. Ambad, Dist. Jalna

.. RESPONDENTS

Mr. T.M. Tandale, advocate for petitioner.

Mr. A.P. Bhandari, advocate for respondent nos. 1 and 2.

=====

CORAM : S. B. SHUKRE, J.

DATE : 31st JANUARY, 2017.

ORAL JUDGMENT :

1. Heard.

2. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith.

3. Heard finally by consent of learned counsel for respective parties.

4. On going through the order dated 1st February, 2016, impugned in th

is petition, I do not find any patent illegality or perversity therein. Amendment application vide Exh. 83 does not disclose as to how the proposed amendments are necessary and would help the Court in deciding the controversy finally. Infact, no relief has been claimed by petitioner in respect of anything done by the authorities in the land acquisition proceedings in the present suit. Therefore, the conclusion reached by the learned Civil Judge that the amendments are not necessary and that they have been proposed only with a view to protract final disposal of the suit cannot be said to be perverse or arbitrary. Writ petition stands dismissed with costs. Rule discharged.

(S. B. SHUKRE)
JUDGE

dyb