

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

**905 REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO. 205 OF 2018
IN WP/8570/2018**

YOGESH ANNARAO LOKHANDE

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS ..RESPONDENTS

...

Mr. D. M. Wagh Patil and Aniruddha B. Ghule,
Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. S. K. Tambe, AGP for the Respondents.

...

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
SUNIL K. KOTWAL, JJ.**

DATED : 28th SEPTEMBER, 2018.

PER COURT:-

1. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he could not remain present when the matter was called out and in his absence writ petition is disposed of directing the petitioner to avail the remedy of Second Appeal.

2. The learned counsel submits that in the similar case, this Court had directed the release of vehicle.

3. We have disposed of the writ petition on the ground that the petitioner has remedy of Appeal. The petitioner certainly has remedy of Appeal and in Appeal all the necessary reliefs can

(2)

be claimed by the petitioner.

4. In view of the above, it is not necessary to recall the order, as liberty has been given to the petitioner to prefer an Appeal.

5. Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of.
No costs.

(SUNIL K. KOTWAL)
JUDGE

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE

Devendra/September-18

Devendra
Nandkumar
Kale

Digitally signed
by Devendra
Nandkumar Kale
Date: 2018.09.28
18:10:45 +0530