

(1)

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

912 REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO.82 OF 2021
IN WP/13698/2018

NAGNATH RAVANAPPA CHOUGHULE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Mr V. D. Salunke, Advocate for applicant;
Mr S. B. Yawalkar, A.G.P. for respondent Nos.1 to 3

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
AND
S. G. MEHARE, JJ.**

DATE : 14th October, 2021

PER COURT:

1. Delay of four days is condoned.
2. The learned Advocate for the review petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is tendering an unconditional apology. He was not aware of the earlier two notices issued by this Court and after receiving a bailable warrant, he realized that the Court had issued notice on two occasions. He further strenuously submits that the petitioner respects the Court and does not desire to overbear the Majesty of Law. He draws our attention to the grounds and the pleadings from paragraph No.1 to paragraph No.9 and prays that the observations against the review

(2)

petitioner in paragraph Nos.2 and 3, of the order dated 17/08/2021 may be deleted.

3. We have considered the entire record before us in the light of the submissions of the learned Counsel. We find that this Court had issued notice on 10/12/2018, which was served on the review petitioner. Yet he did not appear. An ultimatum was given on 18/02/2021, which is after 2 years and 2 months. Yet, he did not cause an appearance. Eventually, by an order dated 13/07/2021, we again gave an ultimatum and yet, he did not appear. Finally, we issued an order dated 22/07/2021, thereby directing the issuance of a bailable warrant. In view of the bailable warrant, the review petitioner appeared before us and did not even utter a single sentence, either orally or in his affidavit-in-reply, so as to tender an apology for his conduct. After, in the course of the hearing, we made it clear that we are making observations against his conduct, then he agreed to tender an apology as if he desired to oblige the Court with such an apology.

4. In view of the above, we do not find that the apology tendered in the review petition is genuine or heartfelt. It is an

(3)

apology which is superficial and aimed at saving himself from the order containing the observations against him.

5. In view of the above, this review petition is dismissed.

(S. G. MEHARE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

sjk