

219 WRIT PETITION NO. 2669 OF 2004

VERSUS

...

...

PER COURT: -

2. The respondents had undertaken the work of widening bridge, which according to the petitioner is improper. The affidavit at the relevant time was filed by respondent no.3-M.S.R.D.C.. The recommendations of the committee were considered. The committee also recommended to

widen the bridge and accordingly work was undertaken. There is imperative need to widen the existing narrow bridge to avoid accidents.

3. It is submitted that the work of the widening of the bridge has already been undertaken and completed.

4. In view of that, as the work of widening of bridge is already completed, nothing would survive in the present petition.

5. In case the grievance of the petitioner subsist, then petitioner may take appropriate steps in that regard. Rule discharged. No costs.

(R. G. AVACHAT)
JUDGE

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE