

BIPIN
DHARMENDER
PRITHIANI
Digitally signed
by BIPIN
DHARMENDER
PRITHIANI
Date: 2022.09.17
15:31:42 +0530

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 10691 OF 2022

Dilip Raghunath Pol ... Petitioner
Versus
Bank of Maharashtra and Ors. ... Respondents

Mrs. Sneha Prabhu a/w Ms. Kinnari Mehta for the Petitioner.
Mr. Girish Utangale a/w Mr. Shahzad M. Pandey i/by M/s. Utangale &
Co. for the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

**CORAM: S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
R. N. LADDHA, JJ.**

DATE : 16th SEPTEMBER, 2022

P.C. :-

1. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Identification Committee did not provide the necessary opportunity to the petitioner, many applications were filed before the Identification Committee for the opportunity of hearing but no cognizance was taken of the same.

2. The learned counsel for respondent nos. 1 and 2 submits that the opportunity was provided to the petitioner, the contention of the petitioner that no opportunity was provided by the Identification Committee is erroneous. The learned counsel further submits that the petitioner has a remedy before the Review Committee.

3. As the petitioner has a remedy before the Review Committee, the petitioner can raise all the grounds available to him before the Review Committee.

4. In light of that, at this stage, we are not inclined to consider the petition on merits.

5. Writ Petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to avail alternate remedy. In that event, all contentions are open. No costs.

[R. N. LADDHA, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]