

SIN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

8 WRIT PETITION NO.9182 OF 2022

SANTOSH HANMANT PAWAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH THE SECRETARY AND
OTHERS
WITH
9 WRIT PETITION NO.9183 OF 2022

SANTOSH HANMANT PAWAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH THE SECRETARY AND
OTHERS
WITH
11 WRIT PETITION NO.9186 OF 2022

SHASHIKANT RANGRAO KOTULE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH THE SECRETARY AND
OTHERS
WITH
12 WRIT PETITION NO.9187 OF 2022

SANTOSH HANMANT PAWAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH THE SECRETARY AND
OTHERS
WITH
13 WRIT PETITION NO.9188 OF 2022

SANTOSH HANMAT PAWAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH THE SECRETARY AND
OTHERS
14 WRIT PETITION NO.9189 OF 2022

SHASHIKANT RANGRAO KOTULE

VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH THE SECRETARY AND
OTHERS
WITH
15 WRIT PETITION NO.9191 OF 2022

SANTOSH HANMANT PAWAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH THE SECRETARY AND
OTHERS
17 WRIT PETITION NO.9194 OF 2022

SANTOSH HANMANT PAWAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH THE SECRETARY AND
OTHERS
WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.9226 OF 2022

SANTOSH HANMANT PAWAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH THE SECRETARY AND
OTHERS

Mr.A.P.Basarkar, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr.A.R.Kale, AGP for respondent/State.
Mr.P.D.Suryawanshi, Advocate for respondent Nos. 2 and 3.

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

DATE : SEPTEMBER 12, 2022

PER COURT :

1. WP No.9226/2022 is not on board. On request, taken on board.

2. The petitioner has put forth a solitary prayer that his request application dated 24.08.2022 may be decided by respondent Nos.2 and 3.

3. We find from the order passed by the C.E.O., Zilla Parishad, Beed that considering that there were several complaints as regards the earlier tenders, that the entire list of tenders for 19 villages was cancelled and fresh tenders have been floated. Obviously, the petitioner is eligible to apply.

4. The request application of the petitioner dated 24.08.2022 is in the nature of seeking a review by the C.E.O., of the decision dated 10.06.2022. We, therefore, do not wish to pass any orders on this count. The CEO is at liberty to decide the same strictly in accordance with Law, expeditiously.

5. In view of the above, these petitions stand disposed of.

(ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)