



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 1951 OF 2026

The President, Jijamata Mahila Gram Vikas Mandal ... Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra Thr The Ministry Of Public ... Respondents
Transport and Ors.

UDAY
SHIVAJI
JAGTAP
Digitally
signed by
UDAY
SHIVAJI
JAGTAP
Date:
2026.05.07
20:45:37
+0530

.....
Mr. Sarang S. Aradhye a/w Shantanu Gurav a/w Dnyaneshwari Utpat for
the Petitioner.

Mr. Dhananjay Rananaware for Respondent Nos. 2 and 3.

Ms. Tejas J. Kapre, AGP for the Respondent - State.

.....

CORAM : MADHAV J. JAMDAR &
PRAVIN S. PATIL, JJ.

DATE : 7th MAY, 2026.

P. C. :

1. Heard Mr. Aradhye, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner,
Mr. Rananaware, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos.2 and 3
and learned AGP for the respondent-State.

2. By the present Writ Petition filed under Article 226 of the
Constitution of India, the petitioner is seeking following reliefs:-

“(b) That by appropriate Writ, Order as well as directions of
this Hon'ble Court, the impugned Notice/ order dated
20/04/2026 issued / passed by the Respondent No.3, the
Divisional Controller, Maharashtra State Road Transport



corporation thereby abruptly cancelling the Agreement dated 29/09/2002 for operating / running Public toilet/ urinal at Solapur bus Stand be quashed and set aside;

(c) That by appropriate orders as well as directions of this Hon'ble Court, the Respondents be ordered and directed to continue the contract/ agreement dated 29/09/2002 with the Petitioner to run/operate public toilet/ urinal at Solapur Bus Stand as per the existing terms of the Agreement i.e. till 28/09/2032;"

3. Mr. Rananaware, learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos. 2 and 3 states that there are disputed questions of fact involved in the petition and, therefore, this Court should refrain from exercising the writ jurisdiction.

4. Perusal of letters dated 7th March 2026 (Exh.C, Page No.35), dated 2nd April 2026 (Exh.E, Page 42), dated 13th April 2026 (Exh.F Page No.43) and dated 20th April 2026 (Exh.H, Page No.45) show that there is substance in the contention raised by learned counsel appearing for respondent Nos. 2 and 3 that entertaining the writ petition would entail examining disputed question of fact.

5. In any case, the petitioner has remedy of filing suit and / or filing arbitration proceedings, as it is a submission of Mr. Aradhya, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that so far as the contract is concerned, the contract provides for arbitration proceedings.



6. Accordingly, the Writ Petition for the above reasons cannot be entertained and the same is disposed of.

7. It is clarified that this Court has not considered the merits of the matter and all contentions on merits are expressly kept open.

[PRAVIN S. PATIL, J.]

[MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.]