

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION NO.3 OF 2018
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.1158 OF 2013

Anand Narayan Kambli Petitioner
Vs.
Chief Accountant (Treasurer),
Mumbai Municipal Corporation & Anr. Respondents

Ms C.S. Savithri, Advocate for the Petitioner, absent.
Mr. Anand N. Kambli, the Petitioner, absent.
Mr. Sagar Patil, Advocate for the Respondents.

CORAM: S.C. DHARMADHIKARI &
B.P. COLABAWALLA, JJ.

DATE : JANUARY 25, 2018

P.C:

1. This is a review petition seeking review of the Judgment and Order dated 6-1-2017 in Writ Petition No.1158 of 2013. The review petitioner and his Advocate both are absent. Their names were called out. In fact, the review petition was filed after the period of limitation had expired and we condoned the delay by our order on 24-11-2017. Thereafter, it was for the

review petitioner and the Advocate to follow up the matter. Since both are absent, the review petition is dismissed for want of prosecution.

2. We wish to remind all Advocates and parties who have filed review petitions that if review is sought of a Judgment and Order of a Division Bench, then, at times the Bench has to be specially constituted. After it is specially constituted and assembles, we expect the parties and their Advocates to not only remain present but be ready to argue their cases. It is after considerable administrative effort and time that such Benches are constituted and they assemble for judicial work, leaving other judicial assignments which are equally important. We hope this message goes to the Bar and to the parties as well.

(B.P. COLABAWALLA, J.)

(S.C. DHARMADHIKARI, J.)