

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO.6588 of 2026

Mahadev Ganpati Devkar

...Petitioner.

Versus

The Chief Executive Officer

CIDCO & Ors.

...Respondents.

Mr Sanjiv Sawant, Advocate a/w Mr Heramb Kadam, and Mr Malhar Bageshwar for the Petitioner.

MR VG Badgujar, AGP for the State.

Mr Priyansh Jain i/by Mr Sagar Shetty for Respondent No.1.

**CORAM : ADVAIT M. SETHNA &
SANDESH D. PATIL, JJ.**

**DATE : 15 MAY 2026.
(VACATION COURT)**

P.C.:

1. Issue Notice. Mr Priyansh Jain waives service of notice on behalf of Respondent No.1.
2. Rule. With the consent of the parties, heard forthwith.
3. The limited relief that the Petitioner is seeking is the decision of his representation dated 22.4.2026 made to the Chief Administrative Officer, Maharashtra Water Resources, CIDCO Bhavan, CIDCO, Belapur, Mumbai. It is the grievance of the Petitioner that the said representation is

not decided since 22.04.2026 and the Petitioner is due for retirement.

4. The learned Counsel for Respondent No.1, at the very outset, would point out that the said Authority to whom the representation is made is an independent Authority and according to him, on instructions, is not the competent Authority to decide such representation.

5. Having this being pointed out, Mr Sawant, the learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner would insist that the representation be decided by the said authority i.e. the Chief Administrative Officer, Maharashtra Water Resources, CIDCO Bhavan, CIDCO, Belapur, Mumbai.

6. Considering the above, as the prayer only relates to the decision of the representation made to the said Authority, it would be just and expedient to direct the said Authority to decide the representation of the Petitioner dated 22.04.2026, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of two weeks from making of the same, to the said Authority. The said representation will be decided on its own merits and in accordance with the law.

7. It is made clear that we have not expressed any opinion either on the merits nor on the preliminary issues/objections raised by the learned Counsel for the Respondent, which will be appropriately decided by the said Authority.

8. With the above observations, the Petition stands worked out and is

accordingly disposed of.

9. All parties to act on an authenticated copy of this order.

[SANDESH D. PATIL, J]

[ADVAIT M. SETHNA, J.]