



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

1007 WRIT PETITION NO.14238 OF 2025

Anil Ashok Borge

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra Through Its Principal Secretary UD-2 and Another

...

Mr. N. B. Narwade, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. R. S. Wani, AGP for Respondent No.1/State.

...

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

DATE : 16 DECEMBER 2025

ORDER :

. Present petition has been filed for directing respondent No.1 to decide the representation dated 04.06.2025 filed by the petitioner forthwith, with consequential prayers.

2. Learned AGP waives notice for respondent No.1 and submits a copy of the communication dated 17.06.2025 by the Desk Officer to respondent No.2 calling for the remarks. The said letter is taken on record by marking as Exhibit- 'X'. It appears that respondent No.1 wants to place the said communication on record to show that step has been taken by it in the process of deciding the representation, but according to learned AGP, upon instructions, he makes a statement that the remarks

has not been submitted by respondent No.2. In fact, this Court cannot suggest respondent No.1 how to get the remarks from respondent No.2, however, now upon the oral telephonic instructions from Mr. Ajinkya Bagade, Deputy Secretary, Urban Development Department, it is stated that the said representation of the petitioner dated 04.06.2025 would be decided within a period of three months from today.

3. We take the said statement as undertaking and dispose of the writ petition by directing respondent No.1 to decide the said representation within a period of three months from today.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm