

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

**998 WRIT PETITION NO.15010 OF 2019**

**PRAVIN MADHAVRAO PATIL  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS**

...

Advocate for Petitioner: Mr. Patil Sandesh R.  
AGP for Respondents/State: Mr. P. K. Lakhotiya  
Advocate for Respondent No. 3: Mr. Abasaheb Shinde  
h/f. Mr. V. A. Pawar and Mr. P. B. Salunke

...

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

**DATE: 07<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER, 2021**

**PER COURT:**

1. Heard Mr. Patil, learned Advocate for the petitioner and Mr. Shinde, learned Advocate for the respondent.

2. The respondent has placed reliance on the Judgment of the Full Bench of this Court delivered in Writ Petition No. 92 of 2021 at Goa dated 05.03.2021 to buttress that the present writ petition would not be tenable.

3. The Full Bench of this Court has held that in such a contingency the writ petition would not be

tenable. The Full Bench upheld the view taken by the Division Bench of this Court in case of ***Suresh Bhanudas Shinde and another Vs. State of Maharashtra and others*** passed in ***Writ Petition No. 334 of 2018***.

4. In the light of above, we dispose of the present writ petition with liberty to the petitioner to avail the alternate remedy that may be available under law. In that event, all contentions are kept open. No costs.

5. Needless to state, the Forum where the proceedings would be filed may consider the time spent in prosecuting the present writ petition.

[R. N. LADDHA, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

marathe