

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.**

WRIT PETITION No. 1624 OF 2022.

Dorlikar Wine Shop. Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Maharashtra
and another. Respondents.

WRIT PETITION No. 1633 OF 2022.

S.M.E. Wine Centre. Petitioner.

VERSUS

State of Maharashtra
and another. Respondents.

Mr. Shyam Dewani, Advocate for Petitioners.
Mr. A.A. Madiwale, A.G.P. for Respondents.

**CORAM : NITIN JAMDAR AND
ANIL L. PANSARE, JJ.**

DATE : 25 MARCH 2022.

P.C.

Heard learned Counsel for the parties.

2

2. The Petitioner is aggrieved by the order passed by the Respondent No.2- Senior Police Inspector, attached to Police Station Imamwada, Nagpur City purported to be under Section 142[2] of the Maharashtra Prohibition Act, directing closure of Petitioner's premises for which they holds a licence, for a period of 15 days from 17 March 2022. The order is passed on the ground that on 17 March 2022 there was obstruction to traffic due to customers coming to the shop of the Petitioner for purchase of the product.

3. The learned A.G.P. states that instructions have been received from the concerned Senior Police Inspector, Police Station, Imamwada, Nagpur, who is present in the Court, accepting that the order dated 17 March 2022 would be excessive if it is continued any further. This would mean that the instructions and the stand of the Senior Police Inspector is that the order dated 17 March 2022 would cease to operate from now onwards.

4. The learned Counsel for Petitioners states that in the light of the stand taken by the Senior Police Inspector, Petitioners do not intent to precipitate the matter any further, keeping their legal submission open in case similar action is taken in future.

5. As to the query to the learned Counsel for Petitioners, as to what precaution Petitioners would take to avoid the issue of traffic indicated in the impugned order in future, the learned Counsel for Petitioners states that Petitioners have taken precautions to avoid the

3

issue of traffic as much as possible. The learned Counsel for Petitioners states that two persons were deployed by Petitioners to regulate the activities of their customers, barricades were put up and customers were asked to come in queue. The learned Counsel therefore on instruction assures the Court that whenever Petitioners apprehend that there would be crowd of customers, they would follow the above steps in helping and resolving the issue of traffic.

6. We impress upon Petitioners that they should cooperate with the Police Authorities in reducing the issue of traffic to avoid any situation as present one.

7. In the light of the stand taken by both the parties above, no orders are required to be passed as the impugned order has ceased to operate. Writ Petitions are accordingly disposed of.

(ANIL L. PANSARE, J) (NITIN JAMDAR, J)

Rgd