



fmp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.10114 OF 2024

Bhausahab Vitthalrao Vikhe

... Petitioner

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra & Others

... Respondents

.....

Mr. A.B. Kale, Advocate for Petitioner

Ms Neha Kamble, A.G.P. for State

.....

CORAM: NITIN JAMDAR AND
RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, JJ.

DATE: 18 SEPTEMBER, 2024.

P.C. :

The order which we propose to pass, we do not deem it necessary to issue notice to Respondent No.4.

2. According to the Petitioner, the steps under Section 88 of the Maharashtra Regional and Town Planning Act, have not been taken and, therefore, the Petitioner has made representation and raised queries as to the position/ statutory requirements. Learned counsel for the Petitioner states that, in spite of notices/ applications

fmp

made in the year 2020, there is no response. Learned counsel for the Petitioner sought to contend what could be the response of the Respondents No.4 and 6 to proceed on that basis. However, we do not find on record that there is any specific stand taken by Respondent No.4. In these circumstances, we direct Respondent No.4 to communicate its stand to the Petitioner as per the Petitioner's application annexed to this Petition, within a period of four weeks from the date the Petitioner serves the copy of this order on the Respondent No.4. We make it clear that we have not adjudicated the Petitioner's claim on merits. We have directed the Respondent No.4 to make its stand clear so that the Petitioner can take necessary steps.

3. With the above directions, Writ Petition stands disposed off.

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

(NITIN JAMDAR, J.)

fmp/-