

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

**REVIEW APPLICATION ST. NO. 5423 OF 2014
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 5001 OF 2013**

The State of Maharashtra
& others

.. APPLICANTS

VERSUS

Meena w/o Madhukar Ghayal

.. RESPONDENT

Mrs. A.V. Gondhalekar, AGP for the State.

=====

**CORAM : R.M. BORDE &
A.I.S. CHEEMA JJ.
DATE : 5th MAY, 2015.**

PER COURT :

1. The judgment and order passed by us on 13.11.2013 is a matter of challenge in this review application. This Court, while granting relief in favour of the petitioner, has placed reliance on a judgment in Writ Petition No. 02.07.2011 in the matter of State Vs. Sudhir Doke. Similarly placed petitioner i.e. Sudhir Doke approached the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal by presenting Original Application No. 1242/2009 questioning the order of termination issued to him. The original application was allowed and the writ petition challenging the decision rendered by Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal to the High Court has been dismissed by the Division Bench of this Court and a Special Leave Petition challenging said decision has also been dismissed by the Supreme Court on 18.11.2011. In identical circumstances, the Division Bench of this Court in Writ Petition No. 7071/2011 granted relief in favour of the petitioner therein who was also

similarly situate. This Court has referred to the judgment in the aforesaid writ petitions while granting relief in favour of the petitioner. The decision rendered by Division Bench of this court in Writ Petition No. 7071/2011 was also a matter of challenge before the Supreme court and the Special Leave Petition presented by the State Government has been dismissed by the Apex Court. It has not been pointed out as to what are the distinguishing features in the instant petition and the matter which are dealt with by this Court referred to in the judgment.

2. The review application raises grounds which are required to be dealt with by the appellate court. The application for review cannot be considered as the appeal in disguise. No interference is called for in the application seeking review of the order passed by us earlier. Application as such stands rejected.

(A. I. S. CHEEMA)
JUDGE

(R. M. BORDE)
JUDGE

dyb