

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

907 CIVIL APPLICATION NO.8008 OF 2021
IN WP/7021/2018 WITH WP/13522/2017 WITH CA/5074/2021 IN
WP/7036/2018 WITH CA/104/2021 IN WP/7025/2018 WITH
CA/2057/2021 IN WP/7022/2018 WITH WP/13548/2017 WITH
WP/12835/2017 WITH WP/13532/2017 WITH WP/4790/2018 WITH
CA/3413/2021 IN WP/11931/2018 WITH CA/3202/2021 IN
WP/11937/2018 WITH CA/2063/2021 IN WP/11934/2018 WITH
CA/2078/2021 IN WP/11935/2018 WITH WP/12839/2017 WITH
CA/5075/2021 IN WP/7038/2018 WITH CA/5076/2021 IN WP/7027/2018
WITH WP/12841/2017 WITH CA/2080/2021 IN WP/11928/2018 WITH
CA/3200/2021 IN WP/7028/2018 WITH CA/5072/2021 IN
WP/11930/2018 WITH CA/5073/2021 IN WP/11929/2018 WITH
WP/13525/2017 WITH CA/3997/2021 IN WP/7024/2018 WITH
WP/12840/2017 WITH WP/12843/2017 WITH WP/12837/2017 WITH
WP/12838/2017 WITH CA/3999/2021 IN WP/11936/2018 WITH
WP/12836/2017 WITH CA/2081/2021 IN WP/11927/2018 WITH
CA/4034/2021 IN WP/11926/2018 WITH WP/13533/2017 WITH
CA/5071/2021 IN WP/11933/2018 WITH WP/12842/2017 WITH
CA/5077/2021 IN WP/7037/2018 WITH CA/3203/2021 IN WP/7026/2018
WITH CA/2059/2021 IN WP/11932/2018 WITH WP/12834/2017

PARBHANI DISTRICT CENTRAL COOPERATIVE BANK LIMITED PARBHANI
THROUGH ITS GENERAL MANAGER
VERSUS
RAMA BHIKAJI WANARE

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Ghute Amit T.
Advocate for Respondent : Mr. Suryawanshi Prashant D., Mr. Y.R. Barhate
respectively.

CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL, J.
DATE : 17.11.2021.

PER COURT :

Heard both the sides.

2. The parties were before the Supreme Court in Special Leave to Appeal (C.A.) No. 19409/2019 arising out of the judgment and order dated 30.04.2019 of this Court in Writ Petition No. 7037/2018. By the order

dated 09.12.2019 though the Special Leave Petitions were disposed of without granting any relief in substance, the petitioner-Bank was granted liberty to apply to this Court praying for facility of installments. It was specifically indicated in the order that if such an application was filed within three weeks from that order this Court should consider it and grant reasonable time to the petitioner-Bank to pay in installments.

3. It is a matter of record that since thereafter, from time to time the petitioner-Bank has availed opportunity and even this Court had granted adjournments liberally. In fact, as can be appreciated no such concession was permitted to be given by this Court in the light of the observations of the Supreme Court.

4. In spite of such state of affairs, once again a request has been made for extension of time.

5. The Applications are rejected.

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)

mkd/-