

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
BENCH AT AURANGABAD.

930 WRIT PETITION NO.9008 OF 2021

M/S JOSHI FREIGHT CARRIER,
THROUGH PARTNER MANOJ BIHARILAL JOSHI
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. S. U. Chaudhari.

AGP for Respondent/State: Mr. S. G. Karlekar.

...

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

DATE : 18th August, 2021.

P.C.:

. We have heard Mr. Chaudhari, learned counsel for petitioner.

2 It appears that the petition is premature. The learned counsel for petitioner submits that the respondents be directed to decide the complaint filed by the petitioner against the contractor.

3 We find that the authority has nowhere denied to decide the complaint of the petitioner. The communication dated 9th August, 2021 is placed on record. Reading the said communication, it is manifest that the authority has taken cognizance of the complaint of the petitioner and pursuant to the complaint of the petitioner show cause notice is also issued to the person against whom the complaint is filed. It is further stated that as yet the reply is not received and once the

reply is received, the petitioner would be intimated about it.

4 In case, without considering the objection of the petitioner, if further steps are undertaken, then the petitioner would have a right to agitate. At present, in our opinion, the petition is premature.

5 The writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

6 All contentions are kept open.

[R. N. LADDHA, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

nga