

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 1810 OF 2015

PRAVIN JAGANNATHRAO ANDOLE
VERSUS
PRINCIPAL DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT,
PARBHANI AND ANOTHER

...
Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Paranjape Prakash S. and Mr. Wagh M R
Advocate for respondent Nos. 1 and 2: Mr. R.J. Godbole

.....

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
V. K. JADHAV, JJ.**

DATED : 14th JULY, 2015

P.C. :-

1. We have heard Mr. Paranjape, the learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Godbole, the learned counsel for the respondent Nos. 1 and 2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in fact the charges in the second enquiry i.e. D.E. No. 5 of 2014 are based upon the charges in the earlier enquiry i.e. D.E. No. 1 of 2011. They both are interdependent on each other. In case the petitioner is exonerated in the first enquiry, then it may not be necessary to continue with the proceeding of second enquiry. As such both the enquiries be amalgamated.

2. Mr. Godbole, the learned counsel for the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 submits that D.E. Nos.1 of 2011 and 5 of 2014 are based on

different charges.

3. On the last date, we had asked Mr. Godbole as to whether both the enquiries can be conducted simultaneously and by the same Enquiry Officer. Today, Mr. Godbole, upon taking instructions, submits that both the enquiries can be conducted simultaneously and by one Enquiry Officer.

4. In view of the said statement made, there is no need to pass any separate order. The said statement is accepted. In view of the said statement, writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

(V. K. JADHAV, J.)

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.)

rlj/