

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

**998 CONT. PETITION NO. 152 OF 2023
IN WP/7700/2021**

**SONAJI SAHEBRAO DESHMUKH AND OTHERS
VERSUS
MR MANUKUMAR SRIVASTAVA AND OTHERS**

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Revan P. Bhumkar
Advocate for Respondent No. 2 : Mr. Ajay G. Talhar
AGP for Respondent Nos. 3 to 6 : Ms. S.S. Joshi

...

**CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL &
SHAILESH P. BRAHME, JJ.**

DATE : 07 FEBRUARY 2024

PER COURT :

Heard.

2. By the order of which the petitioners are seeking implementation, respondent nos. 1 to 3, 5 and 6, competent authority, were directed to consider and decide their representation.

3. As is pointed out in the affidavit-in-reply filed by respondent no. 5, respondent no. 3 has already communicated the decision of the State Government vide communication dated 10 May 2022, addressed to the petitioners. Copy of which is annexed to the affidavit-in-reply.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioners submits that in fact the respondent nos. 5 and 6 being the competent authorities should have taken decision, in stead, respondent nos. 1 to 3 seems to have taken the decision.

5. Once the decision has been taken by the State Government holding petitioners not entitled to derive any benefit under the concerned Government Resolutions, nothing survives. Contempt Petition is disposed of.

6. Needless to state, it would always be open for the petitioners to challenge the decision dated 10 May 2022 communicated to them.

[SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.]

[MANGESH S. PATIL, J.]