

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

**REVIEW APPLICATION NO.241 OF 2016
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.11622 OF 2015**

Bhanudas s/o Tukaram Kharat

...APPLICANT

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra
and another.

...RESPONDENTS

...
Mr.Nitin S. Kadarale Advocate for Applicant.
Mr.S.G. Karlekar, A.G.P. for Resp. No.1.
...

**CORAM: S.S. SHINDE AND
SANGITRAO S. PATIL, JJ.**

DATE : 10TH FEBRUARY, 2017

ORDER :

. Heard learned counsel appearing for the Applicant. He submits that while hearing the Writ Petition, Judgment of the Division Bench of the Bombay High Court, Bench at Nagpur in the case of

Samadhan Rajaram Umak vs. Dr. Punjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth and anther¹ was not considered. He further submits that the Government Resolution issued by the General Administration Department dated 29th July 1993 was not considered by this Court while hearing the Writ Petition. Therefore, he submits that Review Application deserves consideration.

2. We have heard learned counsel appearing for the Applicant at length and with his able assistance perused the grounds taken in the Review Application and also the annexures thereto. In respect of the Judgment in the case of **Samadhan Rajaram Umak vs. Dr. Punjabrao Deshmukh Krishi Vidyapeeth and anther**, cited supra, since the same was not brought to the notice of this Court while hearing the Writ Petition, there was no question of considering the said Judgment. So far as the Government Resolution is concerned, this Court not

1 2011(5) ALL M.R. 267

only considered the subsequent Government Resolution issued in the year 2002 but also considered the relevant rules. Therefore, we do not find any reason to review the order under Review. There is no error apparent on the face of record. Hence the Review Application stands rejected.

[SANGITRAO S. PATIL, J.]

[S.S. SHINDE, J.]

asb/FEB17