

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

**909 WRIT PETITION NO.11064 OF 2018
WITH CA/13031/2018 IN WP/11064/2018**

RENUKA SANJAY AMBEKAR AND OTHERS ..PETITIONERS

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS ..RESPONDENTS

...

Mr. P. R. Katneshwarkar, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr. A. R. Kale, AGP for Respondents-State.

Mr. S. V. Adwant, Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 and 3.

Mr. S. G. Chapalgaonkar, Advocate for Respondent No.5.

Mr. Atul M. Karad, Advocate for Respondent Nos.6 and 7.

...

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

DATED : 02nd MAY, 2019.

PER COURT:-

1. We have heard the matter for some time.

2. On the last date the compilation of the expert visiting committee report and other orders were placed on record.

3. It was argued by learned counsel for petitioners that the order withdrawing the recognition of approval has been reviewed and the respondent-institution has been placed in No

Admission Category. We had asked Mr. Adwant, learned counsel for AICTE, as to whether the impugned order dated 14.09.2018 withdrawing the recognition of approval granted to respondent no.7-College still subsist or the said order does not stand. Mr. Adwant, learned counsel sought time to take necessary instruction in the matter. The matter was kept today.

4. Mr. Adwant, learned counsel for AICTE on instructions from AICTE and on the basis of communication received by him submits that the impugned order dated 14.09.2018 has been reviewed by AICTE and that only the initial order of No Admission passed on 30.04.2018 shall continue.

5. We asked Mr. Adwant, learned counsel as to in No Admission Category whether the students in the later years 2nd to 4th year would not be affected. The answer was the institution is not allowed to admit fresh students and institution can continue to impart education to the students who are already admitted earlier.

6. As the impugned order dated 14.09.2018 stands reviewed by AICTE, the impugned order itself does not survive. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, as the substantive prayers itself does not survive, the petition be disposed of.

7. Writ Petition as such is disposed of. No costs.

8. In view of disposal of writ petition, present civil application stands disposed of.

(A. M. DHAVALÉ)
JUDGE

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE

Devendra/May-19