

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 13498 OF 2024

Milind Shriram Limaye	...	Petitioner
Versus		
The State of Maharashtra and Anr.	...	Respondents

Ms. Shruti Talpule, for Petitioner.

Mr. A.J. Patel, Addl. G.P a/w. Mr. M.M.Pabale, AGP for the State.

**CORAM : M.S. Sonak &
Advait M. Sethna, JJ.**

DATED : 03 October 2025

P.C.:-

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. As against the impugned order, the Petitioner has an alternate remedy of an appeal. In fact, in the earlier rounds, Appeals were filed before the State Government Under Section 33 of Maharashtra Police Act, 1951.
3. In paragraph No. 11, a statement has been made that the Petitioner has no other alternate remedy since the impugned order is unreasoned. The impugned order cannot be called an unreasoned though, at this stage, it is not for us to comment upon the quality of

the reasons and/or the validity of the reasons.

4. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner now states that the Petitioner will institute an Appeal within a week from the uploading of this order and some directions may be issued to the Appellate Authority to decide the Appeal expeditiously since the Petitioner has been agitating this issue for considerable time. The above request is reasonable. Thus, if the Petitioner institutes an appeal within 15 days from today, then such Appeal should be decided on merits without adverting to the issue of limitation. Further, the Appellate Authority must endeavor to dispose of such Appeal as expeditiously as possible and in any event within two months from the date of its institution.

5. All contentions of all parties are left open.

6. The learned AGP agrees to communicate this order to the Appellate Authority immediately.

(Advait M. Sethna, J)

(M.S. Sonak, J.)