

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO.2921 OF 2003

Katore Sitaram Bhavka and another **..PETITIONERS**

VERSUS

Hind Seva Mandal, Ahmednagar, and ors **..RESPONDENTS**

Mr.Darshan D. Pokharkar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.S.V.Natu, Advocate for respondent No.1

Mr.S.D.Kaldate, AGP for the respondent Nos.3 & 4/ State.

Mr.S.R.Barlinge, Advocate for the respondent Nos.1 & 2, 5
& 6.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.2938 OF 2003

Pramila Yeshwant Mhaske Alis **..PETITIONERS**

Pramila Dinkar Sathe

VERSUS

Hind Seva Mandal, Ahmednagar, and ors **..RESPONDENTS**

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.2655 OF 2003

Bhika Sakharam Kamble and another **..PETITIONERS**

VERSUS

Hind Seva Mandal, Ahmednagar, and ors **..RESPONDENTS**

Mr.V.D.Salunke, Advocate for the petitioners

Mr.S.V.Natu, Advocate for respondent No.1

Mr.S.T.Shelke, Advocate for respondent No.3

Mr.S.D.Kaldate, AGP for the respondent Nos.4/ State.

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.48 OF 2004**

Dilip Vithal Dudhal & Ors **..PETITIONERS**

VERSUS

Hind Seva Mandal, Ahmednagar, and ors **..RESPONDENTS**

Mr.S.R.Barlinge, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr.S.D.Kaldate, AGP for the respondent Nos.2 to 5/ State
Mr.S.T.Shelke, Advocate for respondent No.6

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.2937 OF 2003**

Chandrika Chandrashekhar Pathak **..PETITIONER**
Alias Sadhana Vasant Joshi

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and ors **..RESPONDENTS**

Mr.Abhijeet B. Kale, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr.S.D.Kaldate, AGP for the respondent Nos.1/ State
Mr.S.T.Shelke, Advocate for respondent No.5

**CORAM : A.V.NIRGUDE &
V.K.JADHAV, JJ.
DATED : 14.09.2015**

P.C. :-

1. All these petitions can be disposed of through this common order. These petitions are almost infructuous, because the petitioners had secured their

services at interim stage and they are in service since then. The only question that could arise is regarding their seniority in the school where they are working. The question of seniority can be decided by appropriate authority. The petitioners are given liberty to approach to the concerned authority for deciding the question of seniority.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners state that the salary for the period of one month i.e. July, 2003 was not paid to the petitioners. The respondent institution may submit the bill for the said period to the Pay Unit / Education Officer.

3. All the petitions stands disposed of with aforesaid liberty.

[V.K.JADHAV, J.]

[A.V. NIRGUDE, J.]