

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD
PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO.22 OF 2019

Rajendra s/o Madhavrao Mali & another Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & others Respondents

Mr.Sanket N. Suryawanshi, advocate for petitioners.
Mrs.A.V.Gondhalekar, AGP for Respondents No.1 to 4.
Mr.N.N.Desale, advocate for Respondents No.5 & 6.

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE AND
NITIN W. SAMBRE, JJ.
DATE : 25th March, 2019.**

P.C. :

Heard Mr.Sanket Suryawanshi, learned Counsel for petitioners.

2 It is submitted before us that cause of an issue relating to public matters is espoused in the petition. It is further submitted that the Work Order was issued on 16.11.2017 to the Executive Engineer (Construction), *Zilla Parishad*, Dhule, for initiating activity of construction of the hall in Ram Mandir at village Dahiwale, Tq.Sakri, District Dhule. This Work Order is of the year 2017. It is submitted that representations were made to the authorities and thereafter petition is filed on 14.10.2018 before this Court.

3 Learned Counsel for the petitioners has invited our attention to the communication placed at Exhibit-"T". Perusal of

this communication shows that the Chief Executive Officer, *Zilla Parishad*, Dhule, has forwarded a communication to the Block Development Officer, *Panchayat Samiti*, Sakri, apprising him about the representation/complaint received by his office through the *Sarpanch* of village Dahilwale. The Deputy Chief Executive Officer, *Zilla Parishad*, has directed the Block Development Officer to conduct an inquiry and to submit a fact finding report to the Deputy Chief Executive Officer within stipulated period of seven days.

4 On a specific query made to the learned Counsel as to whether any construction activity is initiated in pursuance to the Work Order issued, learned Counsel for petitioners fairly submitted that construction activity at the project site has reached upto level of casting slab.

5 In view of these facts, we are not inclined to entertain the petition. We deem it appropriate to dispose of the petition with liberty to the petitioners to pursue their representation with the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, *Zilla Parishad*, Dhule particularly, on the backdrop of communication dated 04.10.2018. We make it clear that if the representation is pending decision of the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, *Zilla Parishad*, Dhule till date, the Deputy Chief Executive Officer, on the backdrop of communication dated 04.10.2018, to decide the representation of the petitioner, as early as possible and not later than twelve weeks from the date of receipt of order of this Court.

6 With these directions, writ petition is disposed of.

NITIN W. SAMBRE
JUDGE

PRASANNA B. VARALE
JUDGE

adb