



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

**970 WRIT PETITION NO. 3745 OF 2023**

SHIVDAS NAMDEV JADHAV THROUGH POWER OF ATTORNEY VIJAY  
NAMDEO JADHAV

**VERSUS**

THE DIVISIONAL COMMISSIONER AND OTHERS

...

Mr. Sanket S. Kulkarni – Advocate for Petitioner

Mr. D.R. Korde – AGP for Respondent Nos.1 to 4, State

Mr. Y.D. Kale – Advocate for Respondent Nos.5 to 7

...

**CORAM : SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.**

**DATE : 10.12.2025**

**PER COURT :**

1. Heard learned Counsel for the respective parties.
2. By way of this petition, the petitioner challenges the order dated 31.08.2017 passed by the Additional Divisional Commissioner, Nashik in Revision No.312 of 2016.
3. Learned A.G.P. for respondents, State authorities, raises a preliminary objection regarding the maintainability of the petition on the ground that, against the order under challenge, the petitioners have an alternate and efficacious remedy of filing second revision before the State Government. In support of submission, reliance is placed on the judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court in **Gurudassing Nawoosing Panjwani Vs. State of**

**Maharashtra and Ors.**, reported in *2015 AIR SCW 6277 SUPREME COURT* decided on 06.11.2015.

4. In view of the preliminary objection and judgment of **Gurudassing** (supra), the Writ Petition is disposed of as not maintainable. No order as to costs.

5. The petitioners are at liberty to file a revision before the State Government.

6. If the petitioners file such revision before the State Government within a period of six (6) weeks from today, the same shall be decided within a period of three (3) months thereafter.

7. The delay caused in prosecuting the present petition shall be taken into consideration by the State Government while considering an application for condonation of delay.

8. All points are kept open.

[ **SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE** ]  
**JUDGE**