

sg

22.wp3838-22.doc

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.3838 OF 2022

Sanjeevan Gramin Vaidyakiy &
Samajik Sahayata Pratishtan

.. Petitioner

v/s.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

.. Respondents

....

Mr. Sanjay P. Shinde, for the Petitioner.

Mrs. P.J. Gavhane, AGP, for State.

....

CORAM: SUNIL B. SHUKRE &
G.A. SANAP, JJ.

DATE : 6 APRIL 2022

P.C:-

Heard learned Counsel for the Petitioner and learned AGP for Respondent No.1 to Respondent No.3, who appears by waiving notice. There is no need to issue notice to Respondent Nos. 4 and 5 as limited relief claimed in the petition is against Respondent No.3.

2. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally by consent.

3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that, at this

stage, the Petitioner is pressing for the prayer made in prayer clause (d) and seeks the leave of the Court to file a fresh petition, if need arises, in respect of the other prayers. Leave is granted.

4. Considering the long pendency of the representation of the Petitioner, we think it necessary to issue appropriate directions to Respondent No.2 for deciding the same in accordance with law.

5. The petition is, therefore, partly allowed. Respondent No.2 is directed to decide the representation dated 13 August 2018, which has been followed by several reminders, at the earliest and in accordance with law, and preferably within four weeks from the date of receipt of copy of the order.

6. Rule is made absolute in the above terms. No costs.

(G.A. SANAP, J.)

(SUNIL B. SHUKRE, J.)