

Pdp

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 8135 OF 2017
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 9480 OF 2025
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1681 OF 2017
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 2770 OF 2019**

The Latur Bar Association & Ors. .. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr. Nitin Gaware Patil a/w Mr. Jay Salunkhe for petitioners.
Ms. Neha S. Bhide, Govt. Pleader with Mr. O. A. Chandurkar,
Addl. Govt. Pleader and Ms. R. A. Salunkhe, AGP for
respondent nos.1 and 2.

Mr. Pankaj Savant, Senior Advocate a/w Mr. Aliabbas
Delhiwala a/w Mr. Chirag Sancheti i/by Balwant Solicitors for
respondent no.3.

Mr. Vishwajeet Kapse a/w Dhananjayan Kadam a/w Freddy
Bhadha for respondent no.6.

**CORAM: ALOK ARADHE, CJ. &
SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.**

DATE: 8th AUGUST, 2025

P.C.:

1. The petitioner no.1 is Latur Bar Association, whereas
petitioner nos.2 to 7 are members of the said Bar Association
and are practicing advocates.

2. In this writ petition, the petitioners have challenged
inaction on the part of the State Government in not allotting
plot bearing CTS No. 4580 situated at Latur for extension of
Latur District Court Complex.

3. During the pendency of the instant writ petition, possession of the plot in question has been handed over to the Principal District Judge, Latur. It is also pertinent to note that the plans have been prepared by the Public Works Department and shall be sent to the Building Committee of High Court, Bombay, for approval. Needless to state that after approval of the plans, the proposal for construction of the District Court Complex at Latur shall be sent expeditiously to the State Government, which shall act on the proposal.

4. At this stage, learned senior counsel for respondent no.3 -Maharashtra State Road Development Corporation Ltd. (MSRDC) has invited the attention of this Court to observations contained in the order dated 19th December, 2018 and submitted that the contractor is taking undue advantage of the observations made in the said order.

5. In view of aforesaid submission, it is clarified that the subject matter of the present writ petition pertains to allotment of land for construction of District Court building and is not related to dispute between MSRDC and its contractor. It is further clarified that any observations made in these proceedings shall have no bearing on the dispute between the MSRDC or its contractor and aforesaid dispute shall be dealt with on its own merits in accordance with law.

6. Accordingly, writ petition is disposed of.

7. All pending applications are also stand disposed of.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

(CHIEF JUSTICE)