

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

WRIT PETITION NO.6598 OF 2018

M/s R.K. Construction

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra & ors.

...RESPONDENTS

.....
Mrs. Sabahat T. Kai, Advocate for petitioner
Shri P.S. Patil, A.G.P. for respondents No.1 and 2
Shri S.S. Thombre, Advocate for respondent No.3
Shri A.K. Gawali, Advocate for respondent No.4
Shri U.S. Mote, Advocate for respondent No.5
.....

**CORAM: S.V. GANGAPURWALA AND
A.M. DHAVALA, JJ.**

DATED : 17th January, 2019

ORAL ORDER :

1. Mr. Thombre, learned counsel for respondent No.3 makes a statement that the entire work has been completed and the work orders were issued to respondents No.4 and 5. Mr. Gawali, learned counsel for respondent No.4 submits that, the work under the work order issued to the respondent No.4 has been completed. The learned counsel for respondent No.5 also makes a statement that the work allotted to the respondent No.5 under the work order is

completed and the payment is also received by him.

2. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the tender of the petitioner for construction of Otas was accepted, however, the work order is not issued to the petitioner.

3. It is submitted by Mr. Thombre, learned counsel for respondent No.3 that the work order was not issued to the petitioner, the resolution was passed and the petitioner is black-listed.

4. As the statement is made by the learned counsel for the Agricultural Produce Market Committee that the work orders were already allotted and the work is completed, the prayer of the petitioner cannot be now considered in the present Writ Petition.

5. As far as the aspect of black-listing the petitioner is concerned, it is open for the petitioner to challenge the same.

6. Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

(A.M. DHAVAL, J.)

(S.V. GANGAPURWALA, J.)

fmp/