

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 5151 OF 2020
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 4822 OF 2020

SANJAY BHIKA PATIL AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

Mr. R.R. Mantri and Rahul R. Sancheti, Advocates for
petitioners.
Mr. R.B. Bagul, AGP for respondent Nos.1 and 2.
Mr. S.P. Brahme and Mr. Sushant Pandit, Advocate for
respondent No.3.
Mr. S.V. Advant, Advocate for respondent No.4.

=====

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5152 OF 2020
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 4827 OF 2020

GORAKH SAKHARAM PATIL AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

--

Mr. R.R. Mantri and Rahul R. Sancheti, Advocates for the
petitioners.
Mr. R.B. Bagul, AGP for respondent Nos.1 and 2.
Mr. S.P. Brahme and Mr. Sushant Pandit, Advocate for
respondent No.3.
Mr. S.V. Advant, Advocate for respondent No.4.

—

=====

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5153 OF 2020
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 4823 OF 2020

NARENDRA RATAN CHAUDHARI AND OTHERS
VERSUS

- 2 -

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

Mr. R.R. Mantri and Rahul R. Sancheti, Advocates for the petitioners.

Mr. R.B. Bagul, AGP for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

Mr. S.P. Brahme and Mr. Sushant Pandit, Advocate for respondent No.3.

Mr. S.V. Advant, Advocate for respondent No.4.

—

=====

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 5154 OF 2020

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 4824 OF 2020

UMESH GORAKH PATIL AND OTHERS

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

Mr. R.R. Mantri and Rahul R. Sancheti, Advocates for the petitioners.

Mr. R.B. Bagul, AGP for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

Mr. S.P. Brahme and Mr. Sushant Pandit, Advocate for respondent No.3.

Mr. S.V. Advant, Advocate for respondent No.4.

—

=====

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 5155 OF 2020

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 4821 OF 2020

BHARAT GOVIND PATIL AND OTHERS

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

Mr. R.R. Mantri and Rahul R. Sancheti, Advocates for the petitioners.

Mr. R.B. Bagul, AGP for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

Mr. S.P. Brahme and Mr. Sushant Pandit, Advocate for

respondent No.3.

Mr. S.V. Advant, Advocate for respondent No.4.

—

=====

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 5156 OF 2020

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 4826 OF 2020

ASHOK SOMJI PATIL AND ANOTHER

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

Mr. R.R. Mantri and Rahul R. Sancheti, Advocates for the petitioners.

Mr. R.B. Bagul, AGP for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

Mr. S.P. Brahme and Mr. Sushant Pandit, Advocate for respondent No.3.

Mr. S.V. Advant, Advocate for respondent No.4.

—

=====

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 5157 OF 2020

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 4828 OF 2020

UDDHAV RATILAL PATIL AND ANOTHER

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

Mr. R.R. Mantri and Rahul R. Sancheti, Advocates for the petitioners.

Mr. R.B. Bagul, AGP for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

Mr. S.P. Brahme and Mr. Sushant Pandit, Advocates for respondent No.3.

Mr. S.V. Advant, Advocate for respondent No.4.

=====

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 5158 OF 2020

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 4825 OF 2020

GORAKH SAKHARAM PATIL AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

MR. R.R. Mantri and Rahul R. Sancheti, Advocates for the petitioners.

Mr. R.B. Bagul, AGP for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

Mr. S.P. Brahme and Mr. Sushant Pandit, Advocate for respondent No.3.

Mr. S.V. Advant, Advocate for respondent No.4.

=====

CORAM : V.L. ACHLIYA, J.

RESERVED ON : 25.08.2020

PRONOUNCED ON :13.10.2020

OPERATIVE ORDER :

For the reasons separately recorded, the Petitions are dismissed with no orders as to costs.

2. The Appellate Court is directed to expedite the hearing of the appeals and make endeavour to decide the same as expeditiously as possible and preferably within six months.

3. Pending Civil Applications if any stand disposed of in terms of order passed in Petitions.

(V.L. ACHLIYA, J.)

4. At this stage, Mr.R.R. Mantri, learned counsel for the petitioners requested to issue directions to the respondents not to cause any harm to standing crops in the field of the petitioners till harvesting season is over. He submits that the harvesting season will be over by the end of December, 2020.

5. Mr.Brahme learned counsel for the respondent no.3 and Mr.Adwant, learned counsel for respondent no.4 opposed the issuance of such direction and submit that the issuance of such direction would affect the implementation of public project of construction of road, the work of which to be completed within stipulated period.

6. In view of the overall facts of the case and the Courts below have by concurrent orders refused to grant injunction, I am not inclined to issue the directions as urged by the learned counsel for the petitioner. However, the Respondent Nos.3 and 4 are directed to ensure that no

damage be caused to the standing crop if the petitioners complete the process of harvesting by the end of 15th November, 2020.

(V.L. ACHLIYA, J.)

sga/operative orderWP515120.doc