

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 1357 OF 2018**

Laltaprasad Bagal Gupta	...Petitioner
Versus	
The State of Maharashtra & Ors.	...Respondents

Mr. J. M. D'Silva for the Petitioner

Mr. Abhay Patki, A.G.P for the Respondent Nos. 1 & 3-State

Ms. Raveena Yadav I/b Ashok Purohit & Co. for the Respondent No. 4

**CORAM : B. P. DHARMADHIKARI &
REVATI MOHITE DERE, JJ.
THURSDAY, 10th JANUARY 2019**

P.C. :

1 Heard Advocate Mr. D'Silva for petitioner. Learned A.P.P appears for respondent Nos.1 and 3. Advocate Ms. Yadav appears for respondent No. 4. Nobody for respondent Nos. 2, 5 and 6.

2 Counsel appearing for respondents inform that impugned order is passed by respondent No. 2. Nobody appears for respondent No. 2. According to petitioner, impugned order shows total non-application of mind. He submits that when grievance is in relation to property at Jogeshwari, respondent No. 2 has called for a report in

relation to a scheme located at Worli Division at Abdul Gaffar Khan Road, Worli.

3 He also states that appropriate application pointing out this apparent error has been moved before respondent No. 2, but it has not been looked into.

4 In this situation, as respondent No. 2 has chosen not to appear, we find that interest of justice can be met with, by directing respondent No. 2 to look into application moved by petitioner for correction within two weeks after the communication of this order to it.

5 Learned counsel submits that main application preferred by petitioner is also pending since long. Respondent No. 2 can also attempt to dispose of that application expeditiously.

6 With this direction, we dispose of the petition.

REVATI MOHITE DERE, J.

B. P. DHARMADHIKARI, J.