

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.6157 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION NO.6159 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION NO.6173 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION NO.6174 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION NO.6175 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION NO.6154 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION NO.6160 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION NO.6158 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION NO.6153 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION NO.6152 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION (STAMP) NO.5690 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION (STAMP) NO.5857 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION (STAMP) NO.5865 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION (STAMP) NO.5866 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION (STAMP) NO.5874 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION (STAMP) NO.5875 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION (STAMP) NO.5879 OF 2023

WRIT PETITION (STAMP) NO.5880 OF 2023

Agrawal Foodstuff LLP	] .. Petitioner
Bhagawati Agro Systems Pvt. Ltd.	] .. Petitioner
Bhagwati Cotex Pvt. Ltd.	] .. Petitioner
Bhagwati Cotex Pvt. Ltd.	] .. Petitioner
Sarvambh Agro Industries LLP	] .. Petitioner
Janish Pharma LLP	] .. Petitioner
Siddhivinayak Agro Industries	] .. Petitioner
Siddhivinayak Agro Industries	] .. Petitioner
Siddhivinayak Traders	] .. Petitioner
Siddhivinayak Traders	] .. Petitioner
Sidhipriya Buidcorp LLP	] .. Petitioner
Siddhivinayak Agro Industries	] .. Petitioner
Siddhivinayak Food Processors	] .. Petitioner

Siddhivinayak Food Processors	.. Petitioner
Siddhivinayak Food Processors	.. Petitioner
Siddhivinayak Manufacturing	.. Petitioner
Siddhivinayak Manufacturing	.. Petitioner
Siddhivinayak Electronics	.. Petitioner

Vs.

1. The State of Maharashtra	
2. The Divisional Commissioner,	
(Konkan Division), Mumbai	.. Respondents

Mr. Onam V. Hingorani for the Petitioner/s in all the Petitions.

Ms. A.A. Purav, AGP for the Respondents–State.

**CORAM : SUNIL B. SHUKRE &
FIRDOSH P. POONIWALLA, JJ**

DATE : 24TH AUGUST, 2023.

ORAL JUDGMENT : { Per Sunil B. Shukre, J. }

1. All these petitions are not on board today. Considering the fact that the issue involved in Writ Petition No.4400 of 2023 and the issue involved in all these petitions, both, are similar, all these petitions are taken on production board.

2. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally, by consent of learned counsel for the respective parties.

3. We find that the prayers made by the petitioners are reasonable and, therefore, appropriate direction would have to be deservedly issued to

respondent no.2. Respondent no.2 is directed to finally decide the claims of the petitioners in accordance with law, at the earliest, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of writ of this court, if not already decided.

4. Rule is made absolute in the above terms. All the petitions are disposed of.

[FIRDOSH P. POONIWALLA, J.]

[SUNIL B. SHUKRE, J.]