

pmw

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.393 OF 2017**

M/s. Medley Pharmaceuticals Ltd.	... Petitioners
Vs.	
The State of Maharashtra and Ors.	... Respondents

Ms. Sunitha Perumal i/by Mr. Sachin V. Masurkar for the Petitioners.
Ms. Nisha Mehra, AGP for the Respondent No.1.
Mr. Rajesh V. Govilkar for the Respondent No.2.
Mr. Prashant P. Chavan and Mr. Meet Vora i/by Navdeep Vora & Associates for the Respondent No.3.

**CORAM : A.S. OKA &
RIYAZ I. CHAGLA, JJ.**

DATE : 8th JUNE 2018

PC.

1 The learned counsel appearing for the second respondent has placed on record a printout of e-mail received by him from an officer of second respondent along with a copy of the minutes. The minutes record that consent to operate was granted by the second respondent to the petitioner which was valid upto 28th February 2018. The said documents are taken on record and marked as “D1” for identification. In view of the fact that consent to operate was granted to the petitioner upto 28th February 2018, it is not necessary to keep the petition pending. If application for renewal of the consent has already been rejected or is hereafter rejected, the petitioner can always file a fresh petition challenging the said action. All contentions in that behalf are kept open. Subject to what is observed above, the petition is disposed of.

(RIYAZ I. CHAGLA, J)

(A.S. OKA, J)