

Rane

* 1/4 *

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPLICATION (ST) NO. 33457 OF 2013
IN
REVIEW PETITION (ST) NO. 33456 OF 2013

Dr. Shubhada Mithilesh
and Ors.

.....Petitioners/Applicants

V/s.

Mr. Prabhakar Deolankar
and Ors.

.....Respondents

* * * * *

Mr. Hemant Ghadigaonkar, Advocate for the applicant.

Mr. Pramod J. Pawar, Advocate for respondent no.35.

CORAM :- SMT. R.P. SONDURBALDOTA, J.

DATED :- 6TH MARCH, 2017.

P.C. :-

1). Mr. Ghadigaonkar, makes a statement that, all the respondents have now been served with the Civil Application and that affidavit of service to that effect has been filed. The statement is accepted.

2). This Civil Application is for condonation of delay of 5 days in filing the Review Petition.

Rane

* 2/4 *

3). Heard the Advocates. Perused the application For the reasons stated therein, the same is allowed. The office to number the Review Petition.

(SMT. R.P. SONDURBALDOTA, J)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION (ST) NO. 33456 OF 2013

Dr. Shubhada Mithilesh
and Ors.

.....Petitioners/Applicants

V/s.

Mr. Prabhakar Deolankar
and Ors.

.....Respondents

* * * * *

Mr. Hemant Ghadigaonkar, Advocate for the applicant.

Mr. Pramod J. Pawar, Advocate for respondent no.35.

CORAM :- SMT. R.P. SONDURBALDOTA, J.

DATED :- 6TH MARCH, 2017.

P.C. :-

1). Taken on board for hearing forthwith. Heard the contesting parties.

2). The petitioner seeks review of the order dated 29th October, 2013 by which after taking on record additional affidavit of respondent no.35 and the latest statement of Accounts with details of investment, the petition was disposed off as nothing survived for consideration in the writ petition. Mr. Ghadigaonkar, submits that,

when the documents produced by respondent no.35 in respect of the details of the investment were checked into, it was realised that some more documents are required to be tendered. This statement is disputed by Mr. Pawar, learned Advocate appearing for respondent no.35. According to him, all the documents available with respondent no.35 has been tendered.

4). No such complaint had been made at the time of disposal of the writ petition. Hence, review of the order is not maintainable. In any case, even if some documents had remained to be tendered, those documents cannot be secured by filing an application for review of the order. Hence, the Review Petition is dismissed.

(SMT. R.P. SONDURBALDOTA, J)