

bringing the Petitioners on record. It is also the contention of the learned Counsel that the learned District Judge-1, Ichalkaranji has proceeded on an erroneous premise that it was the Petitioners who were restrained by this Court from participating in the meeting, whereas, in actual fact, it was the Respondents who were so restrained. The parties are therefore put to notice that the above Writ Petition may be heard and disposed of finally at the stage of admission.”

3. Thus this Court had specifically put the respondents to notice that the Petition may be heard and disposed of finally at the stage of admission.

4. Thereafter this Court by its order dated 28th November, 2017 had recorded that none appears for the respondents though they are served. In order to give due opportunity to the respondents, the matter was adjourned to 10th January, 2018.

5. Learned AGP appears for the respondent Nos.7 and 8. Even today none appears for contesting respondents though they are duly served. It appears that the contesting respondents

are not interested in contesting this Petition. I find substance in the contentions raised by the learned Counsel for the petitioners. As there is no contest, the petitioners' contentions recorded by this Court in the order dated 10th June, 2014 remain uncontroverted. I therefore have no option but to allow this Petition in terms of prayer Clause (c).

6. Needless to mention that learned District Judge may proceed to dispose of the Misc. Civil Application No. 33/2012 on its own merits without being influenced by any observations made in this order and the earlier orders passed by this Court.

7. Writ Petition is accordingly allowed.

(M.S.KARNIK, J.)