

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 2095 OF 2017

Bajrang Shantaram Tangadkar

.. Petitioner

Versus

Union of India and others

.. Respondents

Mr. Amol A. Kokad, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. A. B. Dhongade, ASG for Respondent No. 1.

Mr. S. B. Pulkundwar, AGP for Respondent No. 2.

Mr. Alok Sharma, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 3 and 4.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
 R. N. LADDHA, JJ.**

DATED : 30th November, 2021.

PER COURT:-

. Mr. Kokad, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that at the time petition was filed 23 villages of Sangamner Taluka were not covered under any service provider for Mobile network. The same is necessary for communication and all other purposes. Even education is made online. For that purpose also the requirement exists of covering all these villages.

2. Mr. Dhongade, learned counsel for respondent No. 1 submits that out of 23 villages 21 villages are already covered by one or other service provider.

3. Mr. Kokad, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that 20 villages are covered. However, as far as village Kothe is concerned, it is pointed out by the respondents that there are two service providers. One is BSNL and another is Reliance JIO. As far as villages Vankute and Mahaswandi are concerned, these two villages are not yet covered by any service provider and the same may be covered by March 2022 as per the information provided by the State of Maharashtra.

4. In view of the above, the grievance of the petitioner to a large extent stands redressed. For remaining two villages that are not provided by any service provider, we hope and trust that the Government will act upon the communication made and the steps would be taken to provide the said facility by March 2022 as per the information placed on record .

5. With these observations, writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

(R. N. LADDHA)
JUDGE

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE

RS.B.