



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

911 WRIT PETITION NO. 9956 OF 2024

SITA VITTHALRAO SAPKAL AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
AND OTHERS
AND
WRIT PETITION NO. 9960 OF 2024

PANKAJ ANNASAHEB JADHAV AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY
AND OTHERS

...

Shri R. N. Dhorde, Senior Advocate i/by Shri Pralhad D. Bachate and
Shri V. D. Salunke a/w Shri M. V. Salunke, Advocates for the Petitioners
in respective Petitions

Shri M. M. Nerlikar, AGP for the Respondents/State

Shri Sachin S Deshmukh, Advocate for the Intervenor.

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

DATE : 10th September, 2024

ORDER:

1. The 2nd Petition was not on the daily cause list. On a motion
moved at 10.30, the said Petition is taken on the production Board.

2. We have heard the learned Senior Advocate Shri R. N. Dhorde
along with the learned Advocate Shri Bachate, the learned Advocate
Shri V. D. Salunke along with the learned Advocate Shri Mayur Salunke,
the learned AGP on behalf of the State and Mr. Sachin Deshmukh, the
learned Advocate for the Intervenor.

3. Having considered the pleadings in both the Petitions, we find that both these Petitions are filed for seeking implementation of the decision taken by the District Planning Committee (DPC). Keeping in view the time lag between the date of the decision of the DPC, which is 25.08.2024 and filing of these Petitions on 09.09.2024, we do not find that there is any reason to issue a Writ of Mandamus. Clause 2.11 of the G.R. dated 16.02.2008 issued by the Planning Department, Mantralaya, Mumbai is an inbuilt mechanism.

4. In view of the above, **both these Writ Petitions are disposed off.**

5. Pending Civil Application No.10003 of 2024, does not survive and stands disposed off.

(Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

JPChavan