

sg

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.1897 OF 2017

IN

REJECTED CASE NO.1092 OF 2016

Dhananjay Laxman Laulkar

...Applicant

In the matter of :

Dhananjay Laxman Laulkar

...Petitioner

vs

The Education Officer (Secondary),
Solapur And Ors.

...Respondents

.....

Mr. Sarang S. Aradhye, for the Applicant.

Ms. M.S. Bane, 'B' Panel Counsel, for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

.....

CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.

DATED: 14 AUGUST, 2017

P.C. :

. Heard learned Counsel for the Applicant. It is submitted that due to the communication gap between learned Counsel and the clerk of the Counsel, the office objections could not be removed within the stipulated period, resulting non-registration of the petition and the order passed by the Judicial Registrar dismissing the writ petition. Learned Counsel submits that non-removal of the office objections within stipulated period was under a bonafide mistake. He submits that the Petitioner has raised various grounds in the petition and having every

hope of success, learned Counsel submits that the delay caused in filing the present application is due to inadvertence. In view of the submission of the learned Counsel for the Applicant and for reasons stated in the application, the application is allowed. Learned Counsel submits that if time granted, the office objections would be removed as early as possible and within two weeks. If the office objections are removed within stipulated period, restore the petition to file.

(PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.)