



{1}

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 13180 OF 2025

Machve Meghraj Dhanraj
Through its Proprietor Meghraj Dhanraj Machve
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra And Others

.....

Mr. N.S. Shinde and Y.G. Birajdar, Advocates for the Petitioner
Mr. Saie S. Joshi, AGP for Respondent No.1 – State.
Mr. S.P. Urgunde, Advocate for Respondents No.2 to 4

.....

WRIT PETITION NO. 13231 OF 2025

Jishan Mehboob Pathan And Another
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra
Through The Secretary And Others

.....

Mr. S.V. Gundre, Advocates for the Petitioner
Mr. R.S. Wani, AGP for Respondent No.1 – State.
Mr. S.P. Urgunde, Advocate for Respondents No.2 and 3

.....

WRIT PETITION NO. 13246 OF 2025

Shri Sai Construction And Suppliers
Through Its Proprietor Manoj S. Yevle And Another
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra And Others

.....

Mr. G.V. Wani, Advocate h/f Mr. Ms. Varsha T. Kawade, Advocate for
Petitioners
Mr. A.M. Phule, AGP for Respondent No.1
Mr. S.P. Urgunde, Advocate for Respondents No.2 to 4

.....

{2}

WRIT PETITION NO. 13247 OF 2025

Vidyasagar V Kamboj
Through its Proprietor Vidyasagar Vijaykumar Kamboj
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra And Others

.....

Mr. N.S. Shinde and Y.G. Birajdar, Advocates for the Petitioner
Mr. S.B. Narwade, AGP for Respondent No.1
Mr. S.P. Urgunde, Advocate for Respondents No.2 to 4

.....

WRIT PETITION NO. 13248 OF 2025

M/s Patil Constructions Through Its Prop Shahuraj Pruthviraj Patil
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra And Others

.....

Mr. N.S. Shinde and Y.G. Birajdar, Advocates for the Petitioner
Mr. R.B. Dhaware, AGP for Respondent No.1 – State
Mr. T.M. Venjane, Advocate for Respondents No.2 to 4

.....

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

DATE : 17 NOVEMBER, 2025

PER COURT :-

1. Not on board. Taken on board.
2. Learned advocate Mr. Urgunde, appearing for the Latur Municipal Corporation, places on record a communication received from the Commissioner dated 14.11.2025, stating that in respect of the writ petitions, this Court has passed an interim order, and that one petition has also been filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. In such circumstances, insofar as the condition for Geo-tagging, which is the subject matter and cause of the petition is concerned, the Corporation

{3}

intends to cancel the same in the tender document, i.e., Clause XI, as the Corporation intends to complete the development projects within the prescribed time.

3. Learned advocate for the Corporation orally submits that the tender will be floated again in respect of Geo-tagging, and that the rules and guidelines laid down in the Government Resolutions will be followed. The letter dated 14.11.2025 is taken on record and marked as Exhibit 'X'. In Writ Petition No. 13231 of 2025, though a common order is being passed, this document shall remain in the said writ petitions.

4. In view of the letter marked as Exhibit 'X' and the statement made on behalf of the Corporation, the learned advocate for the petitioners in the respective petitions submits that the purpose of the writ petitions would be served. In fact, they were insisting upon observance of the guidelines issued by the Government.

5. Therefore, in view of the statement made and the letter marked as Exhibit 'X', we hope and trust that the Corporation will act accordingly, as the purpose of the petitions now stands fulfilled. We accordingly dispose of the writ petitions.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE