

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

908 WRIT PETITION NO.7490 OF 2025

Amardeep Shankarrao Patil And Others

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Others

.....

Shri. S. B. Talekar h/f. Talekar and Associates,

Advocate for the Petitioners through V.C.

Shri. S. K. Tambe, Addl. G. P. for the Respondent / State.

.....

**CORAM : R. G. AVACHAT AND
NEERAJ P. DHOTE, JJ.**

Dated : JUNE 27, 2025

PER COURT :-

- . The learned Advocate for the Petitioners appears online and seeks permission to withdraw the Petition for the private Respondents.
2. Permission granted. The Petition stands disposed off as withdrawn to the extent of private Respondents i.e. Respondent Nos. 4 to 17.
3. Issue notice to the Respondent Nos.1 to 3. The learned Addl.G. P. waives service for the Respondent Nos.1 to 3.
4. The learned Advocate for the Petitioners submits that he is not pressing the prayer clauses 'A' and 'B' and restricts the relief to the extent of prayer clause 'C', which reads as under :

"C. To direct the Hon'ble Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal to hear and decide the Original Application No. 307 of 2024, expeditiously and in any case within a period of 4 weeks."

5. Heard the learned Advocate for the Petitioners. The Petitioners had filed the Orig. Application No.307/2024 before the learned Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal, Bench at Aurangabad (hereinafter referred to as the 'Tribunal'). The interim relief was granted by the learned Tribunal in the said O.A. which was subsequently vacated. Therefore, the Petitioner had approached this Court in Writ Petition No.4303 of 2024 which came to be disposed off by order dated 24.04.2024, which reads as under :

"1. After hearing this matter for some time, taking into account that the proceedings are pending, we have referred to the order dated 10/04/2024, passed by the learned Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal, below paragraph 21.

2. Considering the controversy before the learned Tribunal and the interim order passed below paragraph 21, vide the order dated 10/04/2024, we deem it appropriate to request the learned Tribunal to proceed to decide Original Application No.307/2024 in the light of the pleadings and the contentions of the parties.

3. The learned Advocates for the respective parties submit that, they would leave it to this Court to make a request to the Tribunal as regards the timeline, within which Original Application No.307/2024 could be decided. The learned Advocates before us, who were appearing before the learned Tribunal, have conveyed to us that, some of the matters, which are taken up for the final hearing before the learned Tribunal, date back to 2013.

4. In this backdrop, we are passing the following order :-

(A) This Writ Petition is disposed off.

(B) Let the litigating parties complete their pleadings in the Original Application as it stands today, on or before 10/06/2024.

(C) Thereafter, the learned Advocates would cooperate with the learned Tribunal and complete their oral submissions within 30 days. Written notes of submissions may be tendered.

(D) After the matter is closed for judgment, we leave it to the learned Tribunal to decide the said proceeding. Since we are conscious of the burden on the learned Tribunal, we are only requesting the Tribunal that the proceeding may be decided expeditiously.”

6. It is the contention of the learned Advocate for the Petitioners that, though the hearing was concluded in the said O.A. on 08.08.2024 before the learned Tribunal, till date there is no decision in the said O.A. He submits that, in the meanwhile one of the learned Member of the Tribunal retired and thereafter, the subsequent Bench has kept the O.A. for hearing and now 16.07.2025 is the date fixed by the Tribunal for final hearing. He submits that, despite the directions by this Court as referred above, the O.A. is not yet decided.

7. Considering the above submissions and the earlier directions by this Court, we again request the learned Tribunal to conclude hearing in the above referred O.A. by the end of July, 2025 and thereafter pass the Judgment as expeditiously as possible and latest within two (2) months after hearing is concluded.

8. The learned Advocate for the Petitioners submits that, in view of the above directions, he wants to withdraw the writ petition and hence, the writ petition stands disposed off as withdrawn.

(NEERAJ P. DHOTE, J.)

(R. G. AVACHAT, J.)