

***IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION  
WRIT PETITION NO. 13588 OF 2017***

Atul Dnyaneshwar Shelar

Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra & Ors.

Respondents

Mr.Sandeep M. Phatak for the Petitioner.

Mrs.M.P.Thakur, AGP, for the State.

***CORAM : RANJIT MORE &  
SMT. SADHANA S.JADHAV,JJ.  
DATE :13th March, 2018.***

**P.C. :**

Not on board. Mentioned. Taken on board.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the parties.
3. A short grievance raised by the petitioner in this petition is that respondent No.3 has not decided the proposal dated 20.9.2013 sent by respondent No.4 (a copy of which is annexed at Exhibit `H' to the petition).
4. Mr. Phatak, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent no.3 is served by private notice. However, none appears on his behalf.

5. in the light of above, we deem it convenient to dispose of this petition by directing respondent No.3 to dispose of the said proposal dated 20.9.2013 sent by respondent No.4 as expeditiously as possible and in any case within four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The said proposal shall be decided independently, on its own merits and in accordance with law. Ordered accordingly.

6. It is made clear that we have not gone into merits of the matter and all points and contentions of the respective parties are kept open.

7. In order to enable respondent No.3 to comply with this order, the petitioner shall remain present before respondent No.3 on 2.4.2018 along with a copy of the said proposal as well as a copy of this order.

8. Till disposal of the petitioner's proposal by respondent No.3, ad-interim order granted on 21.12.2017 shall remain in operation. In the event the order passed by respondent No.3 is adverse to the interest of the petitioner, the same shall not be executed for a period of two weeks from the date of

communication of the same to the petitioner.

The petition stands disposed of.

***[SMT. SADHANA S.JADHAV, J.]***

***[RANJIT MORE, J.]***