

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,**  
**BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**30. WRIT PETITION NO. 1022 of 2019**

Sanjeev Bhagwanrao Kalyankar and others ...Petitioners

**VERSUS**

The State of Maharashtra and others ...Respondents

*Mr. G.J. Karne, Advocate for petitioners*  
*Mr. S.B. Narwade, Asstt. Govt. Pleader for Respt.No.1/State*  
*Mr. N.S. Kadam, Advocate for respondents No. 2 to 4*

**CORAM : S.V. GANGAPURWALA**  
**AND**  
**AVINASH G. GHAROTE, JJ.**

DATE : 27<sup>th</sup> November, 2019

**PER COURT :**

1. The learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are similarly situated as the petitioner in Writ Petition No. 2487 of 2017 decided on 23<sup>rd</sup> October, 2018.

2. It is not disputed by the learned Advocate for the respondents that the petitioner in the present writ petition are similarly situated as the petitioner in Writ Petition No. 2487 of 2017. It also appears that similar communication was the subject matter of

challenge in Writ Petition No. 2487/2017

3. In the light of above, we are following the same course for the reasons recorded in the judgment dated 23<sup>rd</sup> October, 2018 in Writ Petition No. 2487 of 2017. The writ petition is allowed in terms of prayer clause (A).

4. As the petition is allowed by us, we direct the respondents-Zilla Parishad to refund the amount recovered from the petitioners, if any. The exercise of such refund be undertaken as expeditiously as possible and preferably within eight weeks from the date of the order of this Court.

( AVINASH G. GHAROTE )  
JUDGE

( S.V. GANGAPURWALA )  
JUDGE

*Madkar*