

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.****WRIT PETITION NO.6845/2017**

Jai Hanuman Macchimar Sahakari Sanstha Ltd. Nagpur .vs. State of Maharashtra through its Secretary, Department of Agricultural, Animal Husbandry, Dairy Development and Fisheries, Mumbai and Ors.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. T. S. Kene, Advocate for petitioner.

Mr. A. Madiwale, A.G.P. for respondent no.1.

Mr. P. Khubalkar, Advocate for respondent nos. 2 and 3.

Mr. C. Sharma, Advocate for respondent no.4.

CORAM : V. M. DESHPANDE AND

S. M. MODAK, JJ.

DATED : FEBRUARY, 20, 2020

Heard Mr. Kene, learned counsel for petitioner,
Mr. Madiwale, learned A.G.P. for respondent no.1,
Mr. Khubalkar, learned counsel for respondent nos. 2 and 3
and Mr. Sharma, learned counsel for respondent no.4.

Present writ petition was filed challenging the
order passed by respondent no.2-Additional Chief Executive
Officer, Zilla Parishad, Nagpur dated 22.09.2017.

The issue pertains to the fishing rights in respect
of Panjara (Rithi) tank.

Today, learned counsel for respective parties
submit that by Government Resolution dated 03.07.2019,
fresh policy in respect of fishing rights is freshly formulated
by the State Government.

The petitioner submits that he wishes to approach
respondent no.2 in the light of the Government Resolution
dated 03.07.2019 to claim fishing rights. He, therefore,

submits that permission be granted to the petitioner to withdraw the present writ petition.

The writ petition is disposed of as withdrawn with liberty to the petitioner to approach to respondent no.2-Additional Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Nagpur in respect of the fishing rights of Panjara (Rithi) tank in the light of Government Resolution dated 03.07.2019. After submitting its application before respondent no.2, it is expected from respondent no.2 to decide the same by giving an opportunity of hearing not only to the petitioner but also to respondent no.4. It is expected that the said application shall be decided by respondent no.2 within a period of 1 ½ months from the date of receipt of the application.

The writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs. Needless to mention that the interim order dated 13.11.2017 stands vacated.

JUDGE

JUDGE

kahale