

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

WRIT PETITION NO.12095 OF 2018

NANASAHEB BABASAHEB DHARBALE ..PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ORS. ..RESPONDENTS

...

Mr. Pushkar S. Shendurnikar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

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.4, 6 and 7.

...

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

DATED : 02nd MAY, 2019.

PER COURT:-

1. Mr. Shendurnikar, the learned counsel for the petitioner on instructions submits that in view of the orders passed in companion petition bearing Writ Petition No.11064/2018 prayer clause (A) would not subsist and the petitioner would not be required to proceed with regard to prayer clauses (B) to (M). The learned counsel submits that in case, in future some development takes place, the petitioner be given liberty to agitate his rights with regard to the prayers made in the petition.

2. Mr. Karad, learned counsel for respondent-institution submits that, as the prayers are now not pressed with, the respondent is not required to file any affidavit.

3. The writ petition is disposed of in view of the submissions of the petitioner. Needless to state, if any fresh cause of action arises, the petitioner has remedy available in accordance with law.

4. Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

(A. M. DHAVALÉ)
JUDGE

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE