



{1}

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

12 WRIT PETITION NO. 182 OF 2026

Usha Gautam Bhandare And Others
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra And Others

.....

Mr. Bhushan S. Borde, Advocate for Petitioners (absent)
Mr. S.K. Tambe, Addl. GP for Respondent No.1 State
Mr. S.B. Pulkundwar, Advocate for Respondents No.2 and 3

.....

CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.

DATE : 16 MARCH, 2026

PER COURT :-

1. Learned advocate for the petitioners is absent. He was absent on the last occasion also. The matter was adjourned today and it was specifically mentioned that if the learned advocate for the petitioners remains absent on the next date, the matter will be liable to be dismissed. We once again observe that the learned advocate for the petitioners is absent, personally or virtually, without assigning any reason.

2. In the absence of the learned advocate for the petitioners, we have gone through the contents of the petition. The learned advocate for respondents No. 2 and 3, placing reliance on the decision of this Bench in *Priyanka Sidu Nimse vs. The State of Maharashtra and others*

{2}

(Writ Petition No. 13945 of 2025, decided on 12.01.2026), submits that the petitioners are similarly placed and that, for the detailed reasons recorded therein, this Court had dismissed the said writ petition.

3. We have also independently considered that the point raised in the present petition is covered in *Priyanka's* case (supra), and therefore, on the said ground also, the petition is hereby dismissed.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

S P Rane