

DDR

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 458 OF 2014**

Chhaganlal Pandurang Ombase	..Petitioner
Vs.	
The State of Maharashtra & ors.	..Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 459 OF 2014**

Dr. Narayan K. Patole	..Petitioner
Vs.	
The State of Maharashtra & ors.	..Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 3587 OF 2015**

Gorakhanath Baburao Mane	..Petitioner
Vs.	
The State of Maharashtra & ors.	..Respondents

.....

Mr. Sanjiv A. Sawant for petitioners.
Mr. Milind Deshmukh for respondent Nos.4 & 5.
Mr. Amit B. Borkar for respondent No.3.
Mr. Rui A. Rodrigues for respondent No.2.
Mr. S.S. Panchpor, AGP for State – respondent Nos.1 & 7.
Mrs. S.D. Vyas, 'B' Panel Counsel for State in WP/3587/15

.....

**CORAM : S.C. DHARMADHIKARI &
M.S. KARNIK, JJ.**

DATE : 30th JANUARY, 2019

P.C. :

Mr. Sanjeev Sawant, appearing for the petitioners in these three Petitions fairly states that there are subsequent developments and which can render the issue raised in the Writ Petition academic.

2. In view of the fair statement made by Shri Sanjeev Sawant and the in the light of the subsequent developments, these Writ Petitions are disposed of as infructuous.

3. Needless to clarify that though the issue referred is rendered infructuous by passage of time, still the petitioner can claim the relief by way of compensation/damages by suing the State and other authorities on the basis that a representation was made which was accepted and the petitioners and several parties like them acted to their detriment on the said representation. Hence, they should be compensated for the loss caused to them. Such a plea in appropriate legal proceedings can always be raised subject, of course, to the contrary version of the Respondents.

4. Needless to clarify that such proceedings, if initiated, be concluded and decided on their own merits and in accordance with law, uninfluenced by the outcome of these Petitions.

(M.S. KARNIK, J.)

(S.C. DHARMADHIKARI, J.)