



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

1166 WRIT PETITION NO.13638 OF 2024

**SACHIN GULABRAO MORE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THR.
ITS SECRETARY AND OTHERS**

...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Parth S. Salunke and
Mr. Jayendra D. Khairnar
Addl. G.P. for Respondent/State : Mr. A.R. Kale
Advocate for Respondent No.3 : Mr. A.V. Indrale (Patil)
...

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 03rd OCTOBER 2025

ORDER:

1. Heard learned advocate for the petitioner. It appears that the petitioner had already approached this Court by filing Writ Petition No.2749/2022, which was then withdrawn on 17.06.2022 to explore the possibility of a remedy as permissible in law. For the identical prayer, worded differently, it appears that the present petition has been filed. In the first writ petition, apart from a direction to decide the last representation dated 15.07.2021, the petitioner had prayed direction to pay compensation under the head of “loss of earning (business)”. Now, it is almost the same prayer, which cannot be entertained by this Court in

writ jurisdiction so also there appears to be the disputed questions of fact.

2. After the disinclination is shown to grant relief to the petitioner, the learned advocate for the petitioner once again seeks withdrawal of the petition. However, he also submits that after the first writ petition when the petitioner had tried to tender application to the appropriate authority, the appropriate authority had not even accepted the same and, therefore, he seeks liberty for making application to the competent authority.

3. In view of the statement, the petition stands dismissed as withdrawn. If application is made to the competent authority, the competent authority to decide it as per the provisions of law on its own merits.

(AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, J.)

(SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.)