

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

Civil Application (CAO) No. 295 of 2017

in

Misc. Civil Application St. No. 4322 of 2017

in

Writ Petition No. 6960 of 2016 (D)

(The State of Mah. through its Secretary, Dept. of Higher and Technical Education Vs. Social Worker Youth Welfare Society, Nagpur through its Secretary, Omkar M. Kakirwar and ors.)

and

Civil Application (CAO) No. 296 of 2017

in

Misc. Civil Application St. No. 4321 of 2017

in

Writ Petition No. 6959 of 2016 (D)

(The State of Mah. through its Secretary, Dept. of Higher and Technical Education Vs. Shantabai Bahu-Uddeshiya Sanstha Sitepar, Gondia through its President Mrs. M. V. Choudhari and ors.)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
 appearances, Court's orders or directions
 and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Shri N. S. Rao, AGP for the applicant/original
 respondent no. 1
 Shri B. G. Kulkarni, Advocate for the original petitioners

CORAM : B.P. DHARMADHIKARI &
MRS. SWAPNA JOSHI, JJ.

DATED : 06/03/2017.

Heard.

We have disposed of Writ Petition Nos.
 6959/2016 and 6960/2016 on 23-1-2017. A time
 bound direction was issued to the respondents to
 consider the proposals of the petitioners so that in
 case, it was to be granted, new colleges could have
 been started at least in next academic year.

In review petitions, the State Government has pointed out that proposals were duly considered and rejected way back in year 2016. Learned Assistant Government Pleader submitted that accordingly, rejection were communicated to University at Nagpur and that University, in turn, should have communicated that decision to respective petitioners. As there is delay of one day in moving the applications, civil application nos. 295/2017 and 296/2017 are taken out for condoning it.

Shri Kulkarni, learned Advocate appearing for the original petitioner is seeking time to verify the facts. According to him, the original petitioners are not only put to prejudice but also vital time is lost.

We have no hesitation in accepting the statement made on affidavit by the State Government. It is true that had rejection been communicated to the petitioners in August, 2016 itself, the petitioners' grievance on merit could have been examined and redressed, if any substance was found in it. In this situation, we keep all the contentions of Shri Kulkarni, learned Advocate open.

As we see no malafides, delay is condoned. Accordingly, Registry to register respective miscellaneous civil applications for review.

Miscellaneous Civil Application Nos. of
2017

Since the proposals are already disposed of in August, 2016, there is no point in maintaining the directions contained in order dated 27-1-2016. Accordingly, we grant liberty to the petitioners in Writ Petition No. 6959/2016 and 6960/2016 to file appropriate petitions challenging the rejection of their proposals. With these liberty, we partly allowed the review petition and dispose of the same with no order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

wasnik