

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

**WRIT PETITION NO. 9844 OF 2016
ALONG WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 12208 OF 2016**

Satish V. Ratnaparkhi

...Petitioner

Versus

University of Mumbai

...Respondent

Mr. S.D. Paithane, for the Petitioner in both WPs.

Mr. R.A. Rodrigues, for the Respondent in both WPs.

**CORAM : B.R. GAVAI AND
RIYAZ I. CHAGLA, JJ.**

DATE : 6 July 2017

ORDER :

1. The Petitioner has an efficacious remedy by way of an Appeal under the provisions of Section 59 of the Maharashtra

Universities Act, 1994 or under Section 85 of the Maharashtra Public Universities Act, 2016.

2. In that view of the matter, the Petition is rejected, relegating the Petitioner to get an alternate remedy available in law.

3. In the event, the Petitioner approaches the learned Tribunal, the Petitioner would be entitled to the benefit under Section 14 of the Limitation Act, 1963 for a period during which the Petitioner was *bonafidely* prosecuting the present Petition.

4. If the Petitioner approaches the learned Tribunal, the Tribunal is requested to decide the Appeal of the Petitioner as expeditiously as possible and preferably within a period of three months from the date of filing.

[RIYAZ I. CHAGLA J.]

[B.R. GAVAI, J.]