

*IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION*

WRIT PETITION NO. 1479 OF 2018

Ayeshabi Abdulsattar Mujawar nee
Ayeshabi Sayyed

.. Petitioner

Vs.

The Collector of Solapur & Ors.

.. Respondents

...

Ms. Priyanka Raul i/b Ms. Veena Thadhani for the Petitioner.

Ms. Kavita N. Solunke, AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 to 3.

Mr. Mahesh R. Tambe, Sub-Inspector, State Excise, Mumbai.

CORAM : VL.ACHLIYA, J.

DATE : 13th FEBRUARY, 2018.

PC. :

1. In short, the grievance raised in the petition confines to inaction on the part of the Respondent No.3 in not deciding the Revision Petition alleged to be filed by the petitioner under Section 138 of the Maharashtra Prohibition Act, 1949. It is the contention of the petitioner that aggrieved by orders passed by the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2, the petitioner has preferred Revision Petition before the Respondent No.3. The said Revision Petition was presented on 2nd July, 2016. However, the Respondent No.3 has not listed the Revision Petition for hearing.

2. Learned AGP on instructions from Mr. Mahesh R. Tambe, Inspector, State Excise, Mumbai makes the statement that if the Revision Petition found to be filed and pending before Respondent No.3 then same shall be decided within 12 weeks from today. The statement is accepted. The Respondent No.3 is directed that if Revision Petition filed by petitioner found to be pending then same shall be decided as

expeditiously as possible and any event within the period of 12 weeks from the date of passing of this order. It is needless to observe that the Revision Petition shall be decided by giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and all concerned.

3. The petition stands disposed of in above terms.

(V. L. ACHLIYA, J.)