

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 13950 OF 2017

GAJANAN MADHUKAR SONAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Shri Bolkar Yogesh B
AGP for Respondents 1 to 3 : Shri Tambe S.K.
Advocate for Respondent 4 : Shri Dayama Nirmal R.
Advocate for Respondent 5 : Shri Deshmukh Rajendra S.

...

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.
Dated: June 26, 2018

...

PER COURT :-

1. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits, on instructions, that his grievance is redressed by the contents of paragraph No.11 of the affidavit-in-reply filed by Shri Sunil Laxman Lahane, Deputy Director in the office of the Directorate of Municipal Administration, Mumbai and the communication dated 7.4.2018 at page 32 of the petition paper book.

2. Learned counsel for respondent No.5 / original complainant, who claims to be a whistle blower, has entered an affidavit dated 26.6.2018, contending that the corrigendum dated 7.4.2018 is an act on the part of the Directorate of Municipal Administration, which cannot be countenanced. He submits that respondent No.5 would prefer an

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

2 - WRIT PETITION NO. 13950 OF 2017

independent challenge to the said corrigendum if the petitioner is desirous of seeking the disposal of this petition.

3. Learned counsel for respondent No.4 / Municipal Council tenders an affidavit dated 17.4.2018 by Shri Somnath Sakhahari Adhav, Chief Officer of the Municipal Council to contend that the Municipal Council has no grievance with regard to the corrigendum dated 7.4.2018.

4. Considering the statement of the petitioner that his grievance is redressed, this petition is disposed off. Needless to state, the disposal of this petition would not be an impediment for respondent No.5 to pose an independent challenge to the corrigendum dated 7.4.2018, if so desired.

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

...