

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

17 WRIT PETITION NO.12165 OF 2023

**LATTA CHANDRASEN KALE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS**

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. S. B.Bhosale
AGP for the Respondents-State : Mr. S.G. Karlekar
Advocate for Respondents 2 to 4 -ZP Beed: Mr. P. D. Suryawanshi

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.

DATE : 16th October, 2023

ORDER:

1. Copy of the letter dated 28.08.2023 is taken on record and marked as "X" for Identification.
2. We have heard the learned Advocate for the respective sides. Perused the communication dated 28.08.2023 addressed by the Zilla Parishad, Beed to the Petitioner.
3. The seriously disputed questions/issues raised before us, as to whether the Jaljivan project suffers for inferior quality of work or superior quality of work and whether there is any misappropriation, cannot be gone into in the light of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **State of Uttar Pradesh Vs. Ehsan and another, 2023 Livelaw (SC) 887**.

4. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner may be permitted to withdraw this Petition. If advised, she may consider filing a Public Interest Litigation.

5. In view of the above, **this Petition is disposed off** as withdrawn on instructions.

6. If a PIL is filed, we would consider the same only if the Bombay High Court Public Interest Litigation Rules, 2010 are complied with.

(Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

JPChavan