

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

17 WRIT PETITION NO.11738 OF 2021

AYODHYA SURYAKANT GORE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Suvidh S. Kulkarni, h/f Mr. Vishal S. Kadam.
AGP for Respondent/State: Mr. P. K. Lakhotiya.
...

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

DATE : 25th October, 2021.

P.C.:

. Mr. Kulkarni, learned counsel submits that time and again the representations are made. Inquiry was to be initiated against the Gramsevak and the Sarpanch, but no steps are taken. The petitioners have also applied under the Right to Information Act for the documents. The same are also not provided for. The respondents be directed to atleast provide for the documents for further action.

2 The learned AGP appears for respondents Nos.1 and 2.

3 There is nothing before us to conclude or to *prima-facie* hold about any misappropriation. If the petitioners are not being provided with the documents under the Right to Information Act, the petitioners have remedy of appeal. The Appellate Authority can certainly consider

the grievance of the petitioners and in case the petitioners are entitled for the documents under the Right to Information Act and the same are not provided for, directions can be issued by the Appellate Authority in that regard. The petitioners are at liberty to take appropriate steps.

4 The writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

[R. N. LADDHA, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

nga