

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

**36 WRIT PETITION NO. 5767 OF 2022**

GODAWARI KHORE NAMDEO PARJANE PATIL SAHAKARI DUDH  
UTPADAK SANGH MARYADIT  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

WITH  
**WRIT PETITION NO. 5804 OF 2022**

RAHATA TALUKA SAHAKARI DOODH UTPADAK SANGH,  
PRAVRANAGAR  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

**37 WRIT PETITION NO. 5803 OF 2022**

RAHURI TALUKA SAHAKARI DUDH VYAVSAYAK SANGH MARYADIT  
THROUGH THE MANAGER  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND  
OTHERS

.....

Mr. Vithal H. Dighe, Advocate for Petitioners in WP/5767/2022 and  
WP/5803/2022.

Mr. V. D. Hon, Senior Advocate i/by Mr. A. V. Hon, Advocate for  
Petitioner in WP/5804/2022.

Mr. D. R. Kale, GP for Respondent-State.

Mr. A. B. Kale h/f Mr. R. A. Tambe, Advocate for Respondent No.5 in  
all Petitions.

.....

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE AND  
ARUN R. PEDNEKER, JJ.**

**DATED : 26 SEPTEMBER 2022**

**PER COURT :-**

1. In all these three matters, the learned Government Pleader submits, on instructions, that the parties to the proceedings before the Commissioner (respondent no.3) have filed their written say on 06.05.2022. The hearing took place on 19.05.2022. Interim orders were passed on 06.06.2022. If this Court grants time, the said authority would pass a final order in the matter after hearing all the parties concerned, by 15.11.2022.

2. Mr. A. B. Kale, the learned Advocate representing respondent no.5 in all these three matters, submits that he is the whistle blower. It is on his complaints that certain irregularities and illegalities were pointed out and exposed. He would be filing an intervention application before respondent no.3 as he has been conveniently not arrayed by some of the litigating parties.

3. In view of the above, by consent of the learned counsel for the respective sides, these petitions are disposed off.

4. Respondent no.3 authority would ensure that final orders are passed by 15.11.2022. All stake holders would be heard by the authority.

5. Insofar as the intervention applications which Shri A. B. Kale, learned Advocate desires to file on behalf of his client, we leave it to the concerned authority to deal with such applications.

**[ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.]**

**[RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.]**

vre