

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.86 OF 2018
IN
REVIEW PETITION (ST.) NO.6122 OF 2018

The State of Maharashtra and Others ...Petitioners
vs.
Maruti Baban Vinode and Another ...Respondents

WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.87 OF 2018
IN
REVIEW PETITION (ST.) NO.6140 OF 2018

The State of Maharashtra ...Petitioner
vs.
Rekha Gulab Vinode and Another ...Respondents

WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.88 OF 2018
IN
REVIEW PETITION (ST.) NO.6148 OF 2018

The State of Maharashtra ...Petitioner
vs.
Suhas Sahebrao Vinode and Another ...Respondents

WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.89 OF 2018
IN
REVIEW PETITION (ST.) NO.6236 OF 2018

The State of Maharashtra ...Petitioner
vs.
Shantaram Tabaji Vinode and Another ...Respondents

**WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.90 OF 2018
IN
REVIEW PETITION (ST.) NO.6255 OF 2018**

The State of Maharashtra	...Petitioner
vs.	
Shankar Tukaram Wakadkar and Another	...Respondents

**WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.91 OF 2018
IN
REVIEW PETITION (ST.) NO.5918 OF 2018**

The State of Maharashtra	...Petitioner
vs.	
Gulab Sopan Vinode and Another	...Respondents

**WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.92 OF 2018
IN
REVIEW PETITION (ST.) NO.5864 OF 2018**

The State of Maharashtra	...Petitioner
vs.	
Kunda Tukaram Vinode and Another	...Respondents

**WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.93 OF 2018
IN
REVIEW PETITION (ST.) NO.5868 OF 2018**

The State of Maharashtra	...Petitioner
vs.	
Jalindar Bhausahab Alhat and Another	...Respondents

**WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.94 OF 2018
IN
REVIEW PETITION (ST.) NO.5855 OF 2018**

The State of Maharashtra ...Petitioner
vs.
Ananda Ganpat Vinode and Another ...Respondents

**WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.95 OF 2018
IN
REVIEW PETITION (ST.) NO.5913 OF 2018**

The State of Maharashtra ...Petitioner
vs.
Tukaram Nivrutti Vinode and Another ...Respondents

Mr. A.I. Patel, AGP for the Petitioners/State.
Mr. Y.S. Jahagirdar, Senior Advocate i/b. Mr. S.M. Sabrad, for the Respondents.

**CORAM : SHANTANU KEMKAR &
MAKARAND KARNIK, JJ.**

DATE : MARCH 20, 2018

P.C.:

- . Heard the learned AGP for the Applicants/State.
2. For the reasons stated in the Civil Applications seeking condonation of delay, we find that sufficient cause is made out to condone the delay. Accordingly the Civil Applications are allowed.
3. By filing these Review Petitions, the Petitioners-State is seeking review of the order dated 14th September, 2016 passed by this Court in Writ Petition Nos. 4022 of 2016, 4823 of 2016, 8509 of 2016, 4830 of 2016, 4027 of 2016, 4824 of 2016, 4821 of 2016, 4825 of 2016, 4820 of 2016 and 4517 of 2016 respectively.

4. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and having gone through the impugned order, more particularly para 5 of the order, in which on the basis of the affidavits we have recorded that the Writ Petitioners' names have been dropped as accused and when it is not disputed that the Petitioners' names were not in the list of the accused persons, we find that there is no error apparent on the face of the record warranting interference in review jurisdiction, which is extremely limited. No case has made out to review.

5. The Review Petitions are therefore, dismissed.

(MAKARAND KARNIK, J.)

(SHANTANU KEMKAR, J.)