



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

902 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 14488 OF 2023  
IN REVIEW APPLICATION (ST.) NO. 36327 OF 2023 IN WP/296/2023  
**AND**  
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 13293 OF 2023  
IN WP/296/2023

Janardhan Kisanrao Pawar And Ors.  
VERSUS  
Baburao Dipaji Pawar And Ors.

...  
Advocate for applicant : Mr. Pramod D. Pawar  
AGP for the respondent – State : Mr. K.N. Lokhande  
...

**CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL &  
S.G. CHAPALGAONKAR, JJ.**

**DATE : 18 JANUARY 2024**

**PC :**

Heard.

2. The petitioner who was not a party to writ petition no. 296 of 2023, is seeking review of the order passed by this Court on 09-01-2023, which reads as under :-

*1. The petitioner is aggrieved by the fact that in spite of a proposal submitted by the Assistant Charity Commissioner to the respondent Joint Charity Commissioner, Aurangabad for appropriate enquiry in terms of Section 41-E, 41-D and Section 47 of the Maharashtra Public Trusts Act, 1950, the matters are not moving forward.*

*2. It appears that pursuant to a detailed order dated 23-10-2020, the proposal was submitted and has been pending with the respondent since then.*

*3. Apparently, except directing notice to be issued by the order dated 09-06-2021, the things have not moved.*

*4. We dispose of the writ petition by directing the respondent to take appropriate steps and decide the proposal as expeditiously as possible.*

*5. The petitioner is granted liberty to approach this Court if the proceedings are not concluded in six months.*

3. Apart from the fact that the petitioner was not a party to the original writ petition, the afore-mentioned direction expecting early decision of the proceedings under section 41-E, 41-D and 47 of the Maharashtra Public Trusts Act, 1950 was issued. Even if the petitioner is involved in those proceedings, he cannot be said to be aggrieved by the direction. Needless to state that all those proceedings would be taken to the logical end pursuant to the order of this Court.

4. There is no merit in the review application.

5. The review application together with the delay condonation application is rejected.

**[ S.G. CHAPALGAONKAR ]**  
**JUDGE**

**[ MANGESH S. PATIL ]**  
**JUDGE**

arp/