

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

912 WRIT PETITION NO. 4252 OF 2017
WITH WP/4253/2017

VASANT PAULAD PAWAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

.....

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Waramaa B. R.
AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 to 4 : Mr. S. N. Kendre
Advocate for Respondent No.5 : Mr. Sonawane Maheshkumar S.

.....

CORAM : V. K. JADHAV, J.
DATED : 12th APRIL, 2018

PER COURT:-

1. The learned counsel for respondent no.5 tenders across the bar the affidavit-in-reply. The same is taken on record.
2. The learned AGP and the learned counsel appearing for respondent no.5 have raised a preliminary objection that remedy of second revision before the State Government is available to the petitioner. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though the petitioner has a remedy of second revision before the State Government but the scope is very narrow and respondent no.5 is also a volunteer of the ruling party and as

such, no purpose would be served in exhausting the said alternate remedy. However, this cannot be a ground for not availing the alternate remedy. It is expected from the State Government/Minister to decide such dispute in accordance with law and without getting influenced by the party politics.

3. In view of the above, the Writ Petition is disposed of as an alternate remedy is available to the petitioner. The petitioner, if prefers second revision before the State Government within a period of two weeks from today, the State Government/Minister shall consider the time spent in pursuing the present Writ Petition and entertain the second revision as filed within limitation and dispose of the same within three months from the date of its filing. Both the Writ Petitions are accordingly disposed of.

(V. K. JADHAV, J.)

vsm/