



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

10 WRIT PETITION NO.8373 OF 2025

M/s. Aboli Advisers LLP
Thr Its Designated Partner

.. Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra and Others

..Respondent

.....

Mr. Devdatt P. Palodkar, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Mr. R. S. Wani, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 and 2/State.
Mr. S. S. Tope, Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.
Mr. V. P. Deshmukh, Advocate for Respondent No.6.

.....

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 8431 OF 2025

Umesh Dwarkaprasad Sharma and others

.. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
Through Principal Secretary and others

.. Respondents

...

Mr. D. J. Choudhary, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. R. S. Wani, Advocate for respondent No.1/State.
Mr. S. S. Tope, Advocate for respondent No.2.
Mr. A. D. Wange, Advocate for respondent No.3.

...

AND
11 WRIT PETITION NO. 8374 OF 2025

M/s. M. W. Mishrikotkar
Through its Partner
Rahul Sharad Mishrikotkar

.. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
Thr. Urban Development Department and others.

.. Respondents

.....
Mr. Devdatt P. Palodkar, Advocate for the Petitioners.
Mr. R. S. Wani, AGP for Respondents Nos.1 and 2/State.
Mr. S. S. Tope, Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.
Mr. V. P. Deshmukh, Advocate for Respondent No.6.

.....
AND
12 WRIT PETITION NO. 8553 OF 2025

Jitendra Roopchand Jain And Others

..Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra And Others

.. Respondents

.....
Mr. Devdatt P. Palodkar, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Mr. R. S. Wani, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 and 2/State.
Mr. S. S. Tope, Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.
Mr. V. P. Deshmukh, Advocate for Respondent No.6.

.....
AND
112 WRIT PETITION NO.8435 OF 2025

Meghdood Resorts Pvt Ltd
Through Its Managing Director
Nishant Nitin Patil

.. Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra
Thr. Urban Development Department And Others

.. Respondents

.....
Mr. Devdatt P. Palodkar, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Mr. R. S. Wani, AGP for Respondents Nos.1 and 2/State.
Mr. S. S. Tope, Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.
Mr. V. P. Deshmukh, Advocate for Respondent No.6.

.....
**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 24 NOVEMBER 2025

ORDER :

. Heard all the learned Advocates for the respective parties.

2. On behalf of the respondent/Municipal Corporation, affidavit has been filed by Mr. G. Shreekanth, Commissioner, Chhatrapati Sambhajanagar Municipal Corporation, wherein it has been held that there was meeting held between the Municipal Corporation, officers from CIDCO and MIDC on 14.08.2025. Two proposals discussed. One was to take the help of Transport Consultant for designing the smooth curve from west corner of the Guest House of PWD upto this Court's boundary by considering the 60 meter width of the front road from this Court and after its sanction, forward the proposal under Section 37 of the Maharashtra Regional and Town Planning Act, 1966 to the State for modification of the Final Development Plan for minor changes which doesn't alter the overall character. This proposal was approved in the meeting. Accordingly, even a Transport Consultant has also been engaged/appointed on 29.09.2025 for preparation of DPR for roads within the city. It is then stated that the properties of the petitioners are situated towards the northern side of the road and it is the decision to develop the

southern side of the road. Therefore, it is not necessary to take possession or to cause any damage to the properties of the petitioners.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioners then states that since this decision has been taken, the petitioners would wish to withdraw the writ petitions with liberty to approach again, if any decision goes against them.

4. When the authorities have come to a particular conclusion in the meeting and the minutes of the said meeting are also produced, then after appointment of an expert, which in fact ought to have been done even prior to that, the problem would be solved; we dispose of the writ petitions with liberty to the petitioners to approach this Court in case the fresh cause of action arises.

5. It is clarified that all points are kept open.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm