

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO.4919 OF 2016

1. Arun s/o Bajirao Lahane,
Age 40 years, Occu. Business,
R/o Mitra Vihar Colony,
Near Ulka Nagari, Aurangabad.
2. Nitin s/o Bhavrao Patil,
Age 41 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. At Present Pilkhed,
Tq. Chalisgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.
3. Vishal s/o Vishwasrao Devre,
Age 39 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o.11, Jagannath Nagar, Deopur Dhule,
Tq. and Dist. Dhule.
4. Vinod s/o Ramchandra Girnar,
Age 39 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. 27, Gauale Nagar,
Near All India Radio, Deopur Dhule,
Tq. and Dist. Dhule.
5. Sunil s/o Chudaman Chavan,
Age 44 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Sangharsh, 12-A,
Shree Krishna Colony,
Ashok Bread Marg,
Jalgaon, Tq. and Dist. Jalgaon.
6. Rajesh s/o Laxmanrao Thorat,
Age 42 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Soni Niwas, Udaynagar, Nanded.
7. Shaikh Afsar s/o Abdul Hafiz,
Age 42 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Vishnu Nagar, Nanded.
8. Jayraj s/o Anandrao More,
Age 45 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. At Post Degaon,

Tq. Naigaon, Dist. Nanded.

9. Kishor s/o Dagadu Rathod,
Age 43 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. At Post Bhorad,
Tq. Mahur, Dist. Nanded.
10. Naresh s/o Nagnathrao Jakkawad,
Age 43 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. At Post Taroda,
Shobha Nagar, B-101,
Near Airport, Nanded.
11. Salim s/o Masum Shaikh,
Age 50 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. At Post Kolgaon,
Tq. Bhadgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.
12. Sunil s/o Sukdev Suryawanshi,
Age 45 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Abhimanyu Nagar,
Nupur Housing Society,
Tq. Satana, Dist. Nashik.
13. Vishvas s/o Keda Bachhav,
Age 45 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. At Post Lakhampur,
Tq. Satana, Dist. Nashik.
14. Anilkumar s/o Daulatrao Kathole,
Age 45 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Khairao, Post Gangalgaon,
Tq. Chikhali, Dist. Buldhana.
15. Mahesh s/o Sudhakar Baviskar,
Age 40 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Near Ram Mandir,
Wani Galli, Dabhadi,
Tq. Malegaon, Dist. Nashik.
16. Devidas s/o Bhila Aher,
Age 40 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Ganesh Nagar, Behind Petrol Pump,
Kalwan, Dist. Nashik.

17. Nagesh s/o Vishnupant Lahange,
Age 45 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Sinnar, Tq. Sinnar, Dist. Nashik.
18. Pankaj s/o Prakash Patil,
Age 38 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. C/o R. P. Aher, Blg.-43, Ranenagar,
CIDCO, Nashik.
19. Ramdas s/o Dattu Nirgude,
Age 44 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. N-32, R.1-6-4, Near Muktanand School,
Pratap Chowk, New CIDCO, Nashik.
20. Sanjaykumar s/o Madhavrao Gaikwad,
Age 42 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. "Swami Prasad", Nandanvan Colony,
Aute Nagar, Jai Bhavani Road,
Nashik Road Camp, Nashik.
21. Dilip s/o Ramkrishna Lobhe,
Age 40 years, Occu. Service,
R/o. At Post Andhori,
Tq. Ahmadpur, Dist. Latur.
22. Gangadhar @ Rajkumar s/o Nagnathrao Mlkire,
Age 40 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Santh Dnyaneshwar Nagar,
Mane House Near Rajiv Gandhi Chowk,
Latur, Tq. and Dist. Latur.
23. Anant s/o Panditrao Badne,
Age 39 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Flat No.401, Snehaddeep Apartment,
Near Shani Mandir, LIC Colony,
Ring Road, Latur.
24. Suhas s/o Yeshwantrao Katekamble,
Age 44 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Mankhed, Post Kingaon,
Tq. Ahmedpur, Dist. Latur.
25. Anil s/o Sahebrao Patil,
Age 44 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. At Post Waigaon,

Tq. Ahmadpur, Dist. Latur.

26. Hanmantrao s/o Shamrao Sawant,
Age 40 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. At Post Kalamwadi,
Tq. Walva, Dist. Sangli.
27. Santosh s/o Krishna Ghag,
Age 42 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. 402, Zep Society,
Adhav Nagar, Borawali (E), Mumbai-66.
28. Shahudev s/o Kashinath Kadpe,
Age 45 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. C/o D. R. Popale, Shriramnagar, Beed.
29. Suresh s/o Dnyaneshwar Misal,
Age 41 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. At Post Chinke,
Tq. Sangola, Dist. Solapur.
30. Babasaheb s/o Dnyanoba Dhawale,
Age 42 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Shahu Nagar, Subhash Road,
Motimahar Back Side, Beed.
31. Jaysinha s/o Haribhau Chavan,
Age 38 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Pangaon, Tq. Kallam, Dist. Osmanabad.
32. Yashwant s/o Sambhu Nagrale,
Age 50 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. 13, "Dwarka", Godai Housing Society,
Sakri Road, Dhule.
33. Nandkumar s/o Shrikrishna Patil,
Age 42 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. 6, Samta Nagar, Near Govt. Dairy, Dhule.
34. Dinesh s/o Shaligram Bagul,
Age 41 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. 25, Jitendra nagar,
Nakane Road, Deopur, Dist. Dhule.
35. Sunil s/o Ashok Bhamare,

- Age 42 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. At Post Mehergaon,
Tq. and Dist. Dhule.
36. Sanjay s/o Ganpat Langote,
Age 47 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Mogalai Gawaliwada, Lane No.4,
Sakri Road, Dhule, Tq. and Dist. Dhule.
37. Anil s/o Deoram Patil,
Age 39 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Laxmi Nagar, Behind ITI Hostel,
Deopur, Dhule.
38. Rajendra s/o Zendu Mahajan,
Age 38 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. 13, J. B. Balgujar Colony,
Deopur, Dhule.
39. Yogesh s/o Omkar Chaudhari,
Age 41 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. 5, Indira Housing Socceity,
Near Datta mandir, Deopur, Dhule.
40. Pradip s/o Namdeo Patil,
Age 40 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. 5, Jagannath Nagar, Deopur, Dhule.
41. Nitin s/o Ramdas Patil,
Age 42 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. At Post Gartad, Tq. Chopda,
Dist. Jalgaon.
42. Pratapshinn s/o Shivajirao Khoipade,
Age 41 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. Sudharshannagar, Gargoti,
Tq. Bhudnargad, Dist. Kolhapur.
43. Laxmikant s/o Mallikarjun Deshmukh,
Age 44 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. At Post Jalkot,
Tq. Jalkot, Dist. Latur.
44. Ramesh s/o Mahadeo Khade,
Age 44 years, Occu. Service,

R/o. At Post Bedag,
Tq. Miraj, Dist. Sangli.

45. Uttam s/o Ramchandra Sakore,
Age 42 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. At Post Kendur, Tq. Shirur,
Dist. Pune.
46. Sambhaji s/o Ramchandra Sarode,
Age 38 years, Occu. Agril,
R/o. At Post Saradwadi,
Tq. Shirur, Dist. Pune.
47. Annasaheb s/o Devrao Chavan,
Age 44 years, Occu. Nil,
R/o. "Bandhu Prem", Laxmi Colony,
Old Ausa Road, Latur, Dist. Latur.
48. Pravin s/o Sahebrao Gopale,
Age 39 years, Occu. Agril,
R/o. At Shragaon, Post Dhamade,
Tq. Maval, Dist. Pune.
49. Datta s/o Madhavrao Nikumbh,
Age 46 years, Occu. Private Job,
R/o. Plot No.21, Shiramnagar,
Jawahar Colony, Aurangabad. ..PETITIONERS

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through its Principal Secretary,
General Administration Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
2. Maharashtra Public Service Commission,
Through its Secretary/Chairman,
3rd Floor, bank of India Building,
Mahatma Gandhi Marg, Mumbai-01. ..RESPONDENTS

...

Mr. V. D. Hon, Senior Counsel I/b. Mr. Gajanan H. Kadam, Advocates for the Petitioners.
Mr. Mukul S. Kulkarni, AGP for Respondent No.2.
Mr. S. B. Joshi, AGP for Respondent-State.

...

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
S. M. GAVHANE, JJ.**

Closed for Orders on : 19.09.2018.

Order Pronounced on : 28.09.2018.

FINAL ORDER (Per S. V. Gangapurwala, J.) :-

1. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. With consent of the parties, matter is taken up for final hearing at admission stage.

2. The candidature of petitioners for the post of Assistant/Sales Tax Inspector/PSI (Main) Examination, 1999 is cancelled as per the order dated 24.08.2005, 26.08.2005 and 28.08.2005. The same is assailed in the present petition. The petitioners further seek directions against the respondents to appoint them on the post of Assistant/Sales Tax Inspector/PSI with effect from the year 2002 by relaxing age criteria and be given all promotional benefits with other candidates already appointed for the same post as per examination, 1999.

3. On 14.07.1999 notification came to be issued inviting applications for the post of Assistant/Sales Tax Inspector/PSI. The petitioners amongst other candidates applied pursuant to the same. Preliminary examination was held. The candidates qualified for main examination. Thereafter, the main examination was held on 18.03.2001. The call letters were also issued to

the petitioners and others for attending physical and oral tests. The final result of this examination was declared on 31.05.2002. The complaint was received by the respondents about the malpractice and upon preliminary enquiry it revealed that out of 2791 candidates the answer books of 398 candidates were replaced. The candidature of these candidates is canceled after issuing show cause notices to them. It is alleged that the petitioners have indulged in malpractice and their marks are increased by illegal means. Subsequently, the candidature of the petitioners and some others is canceled and they are also debarred from appearing for further examination conducted by M.P.S.C..

4. Mr. Hon, learned senior counsel for the petitioners strenuously contends that the impugned orders are based on so called enquiry at the hands of respondent no.2. No notice of such enquiry was issued to the petitioners at any point of time. The statement of the petitioners were recorded under Section 161 of Criminal Procedure Code by the Anti-Corruption Bureau team under pressure. Thereafter, the Investigating Officer of Anti-Corruption Bureau Mr. Pujari and his team members illegally again recorded second statement at Mumbai under same Section 161 of Criminal Procedure Code. The statements recorded by Mr. Pujari and his team are false. The petitioners and other candidates have not given any statement in the year 2004.

5. The learned senior counsel further submits that the answer sheets of only four candidates that is eight answer sheets two of each candidates were referred to the hand writing expert opinion and all candidates including petitioners are considered at par with these four candidates. It was incumbent upon respondent no.2 and Anti-Corruption Bureau to refer the answer sheets of all candidates to the hand writing expert opinion. No action could have been taken in absence of it.

6. The respondent no.2 has not till date supplied the copies of the original answer sheets and so called duplicate answer sheets to the petitioners. The allegations of the respondent of replacing original answer sheets with duplicate one are false.

7. The learned senior counsel further submits that in the first show cause notice of respondent no.2, it was never stated that the answer sheets are replaced. Only allegation in the first show cause notice was that the marks are inflated by indulging into malpractice. However, contrary to this all further show cause notices are leveling the allegations of replacing answer sheets. This shows the inconsistency and falsity in the case of respondents.

8. The learned senior counsel submits that the then Deputy Secretary and exam controller Smt.

Edwankar of respondent no.2 in her own statement before Anti-Corruption Bureau states that she was Deputy Secretary from 23.03.2001 to 11.05.2001 and thereafter, from 07.08.2001 to 16.08.2001. All the answer sheets were scanned. All the answer sheets after scanning were kept in cupboards and doors were sealed in her presence and the seals were opened for scanning or shifting purpose in her presence and again the cupboards were sealed in her presence. There was no change in seals. The statement of Smt. Edwankar is self speaking. She confirms that there was no manipulation or malpractice in the office of the Commission.

9. It is further submitted that lodging of complaint by Smt. Dhamdhere to Anti-Corruption Bureau was surprising as she lodged complaint against unknown persons, which in normal course ought to have been made at regular police station having jurisdiction that is Azad Maidan Police Station, Mumbai. The act of Mr. Pujari to register crime at Anti-Corruption Bureau not within his jurisdiction, also creates dark shadow of doubt against him.

10. The learned senior counsel submits that except allegations, there is nothing against the petitioners factually. There is absolutely no evidence to show that the petitioners have indulged in illegal activity. The petitioners are in no way connected with the answer sheets, so allegations of

replacing the same holds no water. The statement of Smt. Bhide and Smt. Edwankar leaves no room for concluding that the answer sheets are replaced.

11. The petitioners had prepared all these years for appearing in the competitive examination to be held by respondent no.2. They have appeared for the examination without indulging into any malpractice. They have given the answer sheets in the possession of M.P.S.C. as per rules and law laid down in this regard. The petitioners are made to suffer unnecessarily and candidature of 398 candidates is canceled including the petitioners. Harsh action is taken of canceling the candidature and blacklisting / debarring the petitioners permanently, the same is without any substantive evidence on record.

12. The learned senior counsel further submits that delay in itself would not be a bar for entertaining the present petition. The petitioners could lay hands on some documents recently. For substantial justice this Hon'ble Court may entertain the petition. The learned senior counsel relies on the judgment of the Apex Court in a case of Harcharan V/s. State of Haryana reported in AIR 1983 SC 43.

13. The learned counsel submits that, though, in case of similarly situated candidates this Court at the Principal Seat has upheld the action of

M.P.S.C., however, that would not be a bar to entertain the present petition, as the earlier order has been obtained by M.P.S.C. by misrepresentation and fraud. The learned counsel relies on the judgment of the Apex Court in a case of Ramachandra Ganpat Shinde Vs. State of Maharashtra and Ors. reported in AIR 1994 SC 1673 and in a case of Bhaurao Dagdu Paralkar V/s State of Maharashtra reported in 2005 (7) SCC 605.

14. The learned senior counsel further submits that the punishment imposed is too harsh. The learned counsel relies on the judgment of the Apex Court in a case of Maharashtra State Board of Secondary and Higher Secondary Education Vs. K. S. Gandhi and Ors. reported in (1991) 2 SCC 716.

15. The learned senior counsel further submits that no proper opportunity of hearing is given to petitioners before taking such a drastic action. The petitioners were never given any enquiry report nor were issued notice of enquiry. In view of that, the impugned order cannot be sustained. The learned counsel relies on the judgment of the Apex Court in a case of Anoop Jaiswal Vs. Government of India and Ors. reported in (1984) 2 SCC 369.

16. Mr. Kulkarni, learned counsel for respondent no.2 contends that the petitioners have remedy before the Maharashtra Administrative

Tribunal and hence, this Court may not entertain the present writ petition. He further submits that the petitioners are challenging the orders passed in the year 2005. The writ petition is filed in the year 2016. The petitioners have not given any details about the representations made to the Authorities. The reference to proceedings under the Right to Information Act is misconceived. The petitioners were served with the show cause notices and the respective orders passed by the Commission. After 11 years the writ petition is filed. On this count itself, the petition may not be entertained. The learned counsel relies on the judgment of the Apex Court in a case of Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board and Others Vs. T. T. Murali Babu reported in (2014) 4 Supreme Court Cases 108.

17. The learned counsel further submits that 2393 candidates appeared for the examination in question. The Commission received anonymous complaints alleging mass scale malpractices and cheating by the candidates. Preliminary enquiry was conducted which reveals replacement of answer sheets. A further scrutiny with computer records revealed that marks obtained were different. The quality of paper of answer sheets, the printing, the signature of invigilator all differed. The results were declared on 31.05.2002 excluding the 398 suspicious candidates. The show cause notices were given to them including the petitioners. The

reply was received. Again show cause notices were issued on 09.08.2002 which were also replied by the petitioners and other candidates. The complaint was lodged with the Anti-Corruption Bureau after considering all the statements and enquiry. The impugned orders are passed. About 171 candidates challenged the action of the Commission before the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal at Mumbai. The Tribunal allowed the Original Application filed by these candidates and set aside the order of the Commission. The Commission challenged the said order of the Tribunal by filing Writ Petition No.10854 of 2004. By an interim order, the Commission was directed to issue notices to 141 candidates who were till then defending their petitions and to pass appropriate orders afresh. The Commission again issued fresh show cause notices to the candidates including the petitioners. The petitioners replied the same and thereafter, the impugned orders were passed. Some of the candidates challenged the subsequent order dated 24.08.2005 by filing Writ Petition Nos.9147 of 2005, 9148 of 2005 and 9149 of 2005. The Division Bench of this Court considered all the writ petitions together and by judgment and order dated 06.05.2008 dismissed the petitions and confirmed the order of the Commission.

18. The learned counsel submits that the present petition is filed for the purpose of

challenging the very same order passed by the Commission. The petitioners are from the same group of candidates who had assailed the order of Commission before the Hon'ble Principal Seat at Bombay. The petitioners did not join with their co-candidates before the Hon'ble Principal Seat. Now, after 11 years are challenging the same. The writ petition is liable to be dismissed in view of the dismissal of Writ Petition Nos.9147 of 2005, 9148 of 2005 and 9149 of 2005. The decision once rendered must later bind like cases. The learned counsel relies on the judgment of the Apex Court in a case of Mamleshwar Prasad and Another Vs. Kanhaiya Lal (Dead) Through L. Rs. reported in (1975) 2 Supreme Court Cases 232.

19. The principles of natural justice are followed by the Commission by issuing show cause notices. It is a matter of record that the answer sheets were changed. The quality of papers, the printing and signature of invigilators are all testimony of that. The issue is concluded in the judgment of other matters filed by similarly situated candidates. The relevant claim is not tenable. The Court would be slow in entertaining the jurisdiction of judicial review in such cases. The learned counsel relies on the judgment of the Apex Court in a case of Bihar Public Service Commission and Another Vs. Vinoy Kumar Singh and

Another reported in (2003) 7 Supreme Court Cases 28 and in a case of Secretary, Tamil Nadu Public Service Commission Vs. A. B. Natarajan and Others reported in (2014) 14 Supreme Court Cases 95 to submit that for marking the answer sheets in violation of instructions, strict view has to be taken. The learned counsel further relies on the judgment of the Apex Court in a case of Biswa Ranjan Sahoo and Others Vs. Sushanta Kumar Dinda and Others reported in (1996) 5 Supreme Court Cases 365.

20. We have considered the submissions canvassed by the learned counsel for the respective parties.

21. The 2393 candidates had appeared for the examination for the recruitment of Assistant/Sales Tax Inspector/PSI in the year 2000-2001. The candidature of 398 is canceled on the ground of malpractice. The petitioners are from the group of 398 candidates, whose candidature is canceled.

22. About 171 candidates out of 398 candidates had filed Original Application challenging the orders of cancellation of their candidature and debarring them from further examination conducted by M.P.S.C.. The Original Application was allowed. The Commission filed Writ Petition bearing No.10854 of 2004. The some of the candidates had directly

filed Writ Petition Nos.9147 of 2005, 9148 of 2005 and 9149 of 2005. The order of the Tribunal was set aside and this Court dismissed all writ petitions filed by the similarly situated candidates, whose performance was canceled, so also set aside the order of the Tribunal. The said judgment was passed by this Court at its principal seat on 16.05.2008. The petitioners did not join with the other candidates. The petitioners have challenged the orders passed by the M.P.S.C. after long slumber of 11 years. The reason mentioned by the petitioners appears to be that they have received some information under Right to Information Act in January 2014 and thereafter, they have approached this Court. In fact, it cannot be said that the information received by them could be the basis of filing the writ petition. The basis for filing the writ petition is the order canceling their candidature and debarring them from appearing for further examination conducted by M.P.S.C.. No plausible explanation is coming forth for filing the writ petition after a long slumber of 11 years and that too after the writ petitions filed by the similarly situated candidates have been dismissed by this Court at its Principle Seat at Bombay in the year 2008.

23. The Division Bench of this Court while dismissing the writ petition filed by similarly

situated candidates observed thus:

"Upon considering the evidence which was before the MPSC and which has been shown to us and after seeing the record of the MPSC, including the Petitioner's answer sheets along with the answer sheets of other candidates, the Petitioner's specimen handwritings with their confessional statements made before ACB as was done in the case of Biswa Ranjan Sahoo (supra) by the Supreme Court, we are satisfied that the Petitioners have unmistakably indulged in malpractice by corrupting the officers of the MPSC who had access to the MPSC's records to fabricate and manipulate them by replacement by the simple act of paying them illegal gratification and then throwing up their ---. Right of hearing has been afforded to the Petitioners and has yielded nothing. -----. The Petitioners do not deserve to be public officers. The Petitioners have indulged in malpractices. They have colluded with the other public officers of the same hue and color. **The least punishment that can be meted out upon the Petitioners is to keep them away from public service. The MPSC has been more than fair. The MPSC has acted upon anonymous complaints. It has conducted a preliminary inquiry. It has removed the chaff from the grain. It has issued notices only to the candidates who have been found to be tainted. -----. It has issued not one but three notices to the Petitioners up till now. It has considered not one but 3 replies of the Petitioners. It has passed a reasoned order as directed. The order shows how the answer sheets have been changed at the instance of the Petitioners and for their own benefit; that the marks have been increased; that there is a difference in the hand writing in the answer sheets and the samples of handwriting that the Petitioners have acted in collusion with certain**

officers mentioned therein; that the Petitioners have admitted the payment of illegal gratification. The order further shows not only the act of the answer sheets having been changed but the intention of the Petitioners behind the act and the benefit they sought to derive there from and the consequent presumption which follows as "a common course of natural events and human conduct" by "applying a process of intelligent reasoning of the mind of a prudent man under similar circumstances" as cited in the case of T. Shankar Prasad. ----"

24. The Division Bench of this Court at its Principle Seat at Bombay while dismissing the writ petitions filed by similarly situated candidates has threadbare considered all the submissions. The Division Bench also personally verified answer sheets and thereafter had passed a reasoned judgment. There is no reason for us to take a different view.

25. All the petitioners herein have crossed the upper age limit for appointments. It has been observed that the signature of the invigilator in the answer sheets of these 398 persons is different. There is difference in the papers of the answer sheets and printing. All these facts have been considered. The petitioners claim to be appointed as public servants. Such candidates have to be kept away from public service. Upon enquiry, it was found that answer sheets of the petitioners show marks different from the marks actually

obtained by them. The marks of these petitioners were different in two papers each. The marks were increased by substantial margins. The show cause notices were issued to the petitioners. The reply was solicited and thereafter, the decision has been taken.

26. In case of similarly situated candidates, this Court has already dismissed the writ petitions. The petitioners are not required to be treated differently. The prior decision of this Court in Writ Petition Nos.9147 of 2005, 9148 of 2005 and 9149 of 2005 is based on identical facts and law. The petitioners are from the same group of persons similarly situated. No separate facts are pointed out so as to take a different view. The consistency is required to be maintained, as has been held by the Apex Court in a case of Mamleshwar Prasad and Another (Supra).

27. Considering the aforesaid aspect, there is no merit in contentions of the petitioners. The Writ Petition is dismissed. No costs. Rule discharged.

(S. M. GAVHANE)
JUDGE

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE