

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 12258 OF 2024

Mahendra Madanlal Bafna

VERSUS

The Regional Deputy Commissioner And Another

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Malpani Mohit Rajendra

AGP for Respondent/State : Mr. V.M. Kagane

...

CORAM : S.G. MEHARE AND
SHAILESH P. BRAHME, JJ.

DATED : NOVEMBER 14, 2024

PER COURT:-

1. The petitioner, who is carrying out the work vide order dated 12.05.2022 is aggrieved by the subsequent order issued by respondent no.2 on 21.10.2024 directing him to handover the possession and the charge to the third party.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the action of respondent no.2 is arbitrary. Without assigning any reason, the work has been discontinued. The respondents have not floated any tender. Despite that, the petitioner is asked to handover the charge of the work in high handed manner.
3. Learned AGP supports the order dated 21.10.2024 and invites our attention to the conditions incorporated in the order dated 12.05.2022. The petitioner was allotted the work on 12.05.2022 as a time gap arrangement purely on a temporary basis. The conditions

mentioned in the order discloses that the work was of purely temporary and the respondent no.2 had discretion to modify or discontinue the work.

4. We find that there is no vested right created in favour of the petitioner. The petitioner was not allotted the work in pursuance of any process nor was there any agreement executed in favour of the petitioner. Under these circumstances, we do not find any infirmity or arbitrariness in the impugned order. There is no merit in the petition. The petition stands dismissed.

(SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.)

(S.G. MEHARE, J.)