

IN THE JUDICATURE OF HIGH COURT AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

15 WRIT PETITION NO.18309 OF 2024

Ramling Manmath Bhinge
VERSUS
Dattatray Prakash Gaikwad And Ors

...
Mr. Prasad B Kulkarni, Advocate for Petitioner (Absent)
Ms. T. J. Kapre, Advocate for Respondent/State.
...

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, JJ.**

DATE : 10 JUNE 2026

ORDER :

. None for for the petitioner.

2. Present petition has been filed for following reliefs :-

(a) That this Hon'ble Court may kindly be issued writ of mandamus or any other writ in the nature of writ of mandamus and thereby direct the Respondent No.15 to appoint a Government Officer as an Administrator over the Trust viz. Shree Hanuman Lokseva Mandir, Gardi, Taluka: Pandharpur, District: Solapur;

(b) That this Hon'ble Court may kindly be issued writ of mandamus or any other writ in the nature of writ of mandamus and thereby direct the respondent Nos.13 and 14 respectively to decide the Scheme Application No.74 of 2016

and other pending Change Report and Misc. Applications pending before Deputy Charity Commissioner which are at Exh. "A" Colly. And the Inquiry Application No.72 of 2016 pending before Joint Charity Commissioner Pune may kindly be decided within a period of three months from passing of the said order."

3. We have perused the documents and the contentions in the petition. The petitioner contends that he is the founder Committee member of the Trust by name Hanuman Lokseva Mandal Gardi, Pandharpur, District Solapur. He states that respondent Nos.1 to 11 are the trustees and makes allegations that some illegal activities have been carried out in the Trust. It is then stated that the Inquiry Application No.72 of 2016 is pending before the Joint Charity Commissioner, Pune and also a representation or communication was made with respondent Nos.13 and 14 authorities to decide the Scheme Application No.74 of 2016. Other Change Reports are also stated to be pending. Hence, the present petition.

4. When already the matter is *sub judice*, the question of invoking the powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India does not arise. The petitioner has alternate efficacious remedy before the concerned authorities. Taking into consideration the pendency before the authorities, we hope and trust that those authorities would give

preference to the old matters.

5. With these observations, the writ petition stands dismissed.

[NANDESH S. DESHPANDE]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm