



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

**901 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 4252 OF 2025
IN RAST/27791/2024**

SHRIRAM UTTAM PATIL AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

Mr. Milind Patil, Advocate for the applicants.
Ms. Kalpalata Patil Bharaswadkar, Addl. G.P. for respondent-State.
Mr. Mukul Kulkarni, Advocate for respondent Nos. 8A, 8B & 8E.

CORAM : KISHORE C. SANT, J.
DATE : 06.02.2026

PC :-

01. Heard learned Advocates for the parties. This Civil Application is for condonation of delay caused in filing a Review Application. This Civil Application is hotly contested by learned Advocate for the respondents. However, considering the reasons given in the Civil Application, this Civil Application is allowed. Delay is condoned. The Review Application be registered.

02. So far as Review Application is concerned, learned Advocate for the applicants vehemently argued that there is error apparent on the face of record occurred while passing the order in the Writ Petition, as this Court has not considered the objection raised by the original opponent that the suit filed before the Mamlatdar was barred by the limitation of six months. In that view, the impugned judgment and order needs to be recalled and reviewed.

03. Learned Advocate Mr. Kulkarni vehemently opposes the Review Application. He submits that this Court has passed the order on merit by considering the material whatever produced before the Court. Though ground is taken about limitation, there is no sufficient material to come to a conclusion that there was delay.

04. It is further informed by the learned Advocate for the Review Applicant that till now the suit is not filed by the applicants.

05. This Court is not inclined to entertain this Review Application. Even otherwise the applicants/petitioners are at liberty to take recourse to the remedy available in law. In that case, the order under review may not come in their way.

06. The Review Application stands disposed off.

[KISHORE C. SANT, J.]