

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

WRIT PETITION NO.4927 OF 2022

SUYOG CONSTRUCTIONS THROUGH ITS DIRECTOR PARVEZ
MOHAMMED SHARIF SHAIKH ..PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE CHIEF ENGINEER PUNE ZONE
AND OTHERS ..RESPONDENTS

...

Mr. Sachin S. Deshmukh, Advocate for the
Petitioner.
Mr. R. R. Bangar, Advocate for Respondent Nos.1 to
3.

...

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.4928 OF 2022

SUYOG CONSTRUCTIONS THROUGH ITS DIRECTOR PARVEZ
MOHAMMED SHARIF SHAIKH ..PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE CHIEF ENGINEER PUNE ZONE
AND OTHERS ..RESPONDENTS

...

Mr. Sachin S. Deshmukh, Advocate for the
Petitioner.
Ms. Sudha Chintamani, Advocate for Respondent Nos.1
to 3.

...

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.4929 OF 2022

SUYOG CONSTRUCTIONS THROUGH ITS DIRECTOR MR. PARVEZ
MOHAMMED SHARIF SHAIKH ..PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE CHIEF ENGINEER AND OTHERS ..RESPONDENTS

...

Mr. Sachin S. Deshmukh, Advocate for the

Petitioner.

Mr. S. S. Deve, Advocate for Respondent Nos.1 to 3.

...

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.4930 OF 2022

SUYOG CONSTRUCTIONS THROUGH ITS DIRECTOR MR. PARVEZ
MOHAMMED SHARIF SHAIKH ..PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE CHIEF ENGINEER AND OTHERS ..RESPONDENTS

...

Mr. Sachin S. Deshmukh, Advocate for the
Petitioner.

Mr. Amol Patale, Advocate for Respondent Nos.1 to
3.

...

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.4926 OF 2022

SUYOG CONSTRUCTIONS THROUGH ITS DIRECTOR PARVEZ
MOHAMMED SHARIF SHAIKH ..PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE CHIEF ENGINEER AND OTHERS ..RESPONDENTS

...

Mr. Sachin S. Deshmukh, Advocate for the
Petitioner.

Mr. Aashish T. Jadhavar, Advocate for Respondent
Nos.1 to 3.

...

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE

AND

ANIL L. PANSARE, JJ.

DATED : 21st JULY, 2022.

PER COURT:-

1. Writ Petition No.4926/2022 is taken on
board by consent of the parties, as it was not
listed.

2. Having heard the learned advocates for the
respective sides for some time and as the hearing

progressed, we noticed that, there are several disputed questions like; (a) various extensions were granted to the petitioners, (b) the petitioner has halted work on account of non-clearance of the bills and (c) though the extensions are granted, the works are not completed.

3. The learned advocate for the petitioners submits that he is interested in completing the work and would tender a road map to the respondent authorities, alongwith an affidavit/undertaking vide which he would make the intention of the petitioner clear that, the work would be completed and even if the payment suffers certain delays, the work would not be stalled. He would complete the work within a time frame that he may suggest or the time frame that the respondents would impose upon him.

4. The learned advocates representing the respondents submit that three extensions as on date have been granted. With regard to the work done, only 12% work has been completed. With regard to the Motivational Hall cum Museum, Vehicle Driving

Track etc., work is still incomplete. He, therefore, submits on instructions that, if the petitioner puts forth a proposal with a road map alongwith an affidavit, the respondents would consider the same. However, no assurance is been given to the petitioner in the Court that his request would be accepted.

5. In view of the above, these petitions are disposed off.

6. If the petitioner puts forth a road map alongwith an affidavit supporting the same, on or before 10.08.2022, the respondents would consider the same, preferably within 30 days from the date of receiving such proposal/road map etc.

7. We make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion about the representation likely to be filed by the petitioner.

(ANIL L. PANSARE)
JUDGE

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE)
JUDGE