

drp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.2493 OF 2006

Kundlik s/o Yogaji Gaikwad and Others

PETITIONERS

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and Others

RESPONDENTS

.....
Mr.P.P.Karegaonkar h/f Mr.Pradeep Deshmukh, Adv. for petitioner
Ms. S. S. Raut, AGP for respondent - State
.....

[CORAM : SUNIL P. DESHMUKH &
P. R. BORA, J.J.]

DATE : 23rd JANUARY, 2018

ORDER :

1. Learned advocate for the petitioners states that subject matter involved in present writ petition is similar and same as had been involved in writ petition No.439 of 2004 and requests that similar treatment be given to the present writ petition.

2. Order dated 16th January, 2018 in writ petition No. 439 of 2004 reads thus -

" 1. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioners, on instructions, seeks leave to withdraw writ petition with liberty to prosecute undecided representation and to submit further fresh representation in their cause. He submits, a refreshing representation would be pursued along with pending representation, submitting further

that refreshing representation would be filed within a period of three months from today.

2. *Writ petition is disposed of as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for. It is expected that in such a case, the State government would take expeditious decision preferably within a period of six months from submission of refreshing representation, looking at that the persons concerned are retirees during the period 1993 to 1995.*

3. *Civil application does not survive and stands disposed of. "*

3. Having regard to aforesaid submissions advanced, order in writ petition No. 439 of 2004 shall also be deemed to be an order in the present writ petition and shall form part and parcel of order of present writ petition. As such, writ petition is disposed of as withdrawn with liberty as prayed for.

4. Writ petition as such, disposed of. Rule stands discharged.

[P. R. BORA, J.]

[SUNIL P. DESHMUKH, J.]