

Vidya Amin

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 8851 OF 2021

Ramchandra Shivram Dhotre, s/o. Shivram
Bhaguram Dhotre (Decd.) through Authorized
Representative ShriPrashant Ramchandra Dhotre ... **Petitioner**

V/s.

State of Maharashtra & Ors. ... **Respondents**

Mr. Sagar Batavia i/b. Mr. Angad Giri for the petitioner.
Mr. A.P. Vanarase, AGP for the State.

**CORAM : G. S. KULKARNI, J.
DATE : DECEMBER 10, 2021**

PC :

1. Not on board. Upon mentioning, taken on board on a praecipe as moved on behalf of the petitioner.

2. The limited grievance of the petitioner as raised in this petition is in regard to Clause 2 of the operative order passed by the Grievance Redressal Committee, Mumbai Suburb in disposing of the petitioner's Appeal bearing No. 238 of 2021, by the impugned order dated 21 October, 2021, which reads thus:

- "1. The appeal no. 238 of 2019 is partly allowed.
2. The Appellate Authority is hereby directed to decide the appeal no. 279 of 2021 as early as possible within a period of three weeks from the receipt of this order and till then, parties shall maintain the status-quo as on today.
3. No order as to cost.
4. Order shall be communicated to all parties."

3. Learned AGP informs that the appeal has been already decided

by an order dated 10 December, 2021, as informed by learned AGP, however, a copy of the said order has not been communicated to the petitioner so far. If such order is adverse to the petitioner, then it would be open to the petitioner to take recourse of a remedy as available to him in law.

4. The prayer made in this petition is for continuation of status quo, as stated by the Grievance Committee in clause 2 as noted above. In my opinion, as this is a limited grievance, the petition ought not to be kept pending. It is required to be disposed of directing that the status quo be extended for a further period of two weeks from today to enable the petitioner to take appropriate steps to challenge the order passed by the Appellate Authority, if it is adverse to the petitioner.

5. All contentions of the parties are expressly kept open on any such proposed proceedings.

6. The continuation of the status quo by this Court shall not be construed as any expression to the merits of the rival contentions.

7. Disposed of in the above terms. No costs.

(G. S. KULKARNI, J.)