

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

Writ Petition No. 3299 of 2015

Lata w/o. Raju Bagare,
Age : 50 years,
Occupation : Service,
As Sanitary Worker, in
Municipal Council, Raver,
Taluka : Raver,
District : Jalgaon.

.. Petitioner.

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through its Secretary,
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai - 32.
2. The Director,
Municipal Council,
Administration Department,
Mumbai.
3. The Assistant Director,
Municipal Council,
Administration Department,
Mumbai.
4. The Collector,
Jalgaon.
5. The Chief Officer,
Raver Municipal Council,
Raver, Taluka : Raver,
District : Jalgaon.

.. Respondents.

.....

Mr. Mahesh S. Taur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

*Mr. A.V. Deshmukh, Assistant Government Pleader, for
respondent nos.1 to 4.*

Mr. A.N. Kakade, Advocate, for respondent no.5.

.....

**CORAM : S.S. SHINDE &
A.M. BADAR, JJ.**

DATE : 23RD SEPTEMBER 2015

ORAL ORDER (Per S.S. Shinde, J.) :

1. Heard learned Counsel for respective parties.
2. By way of present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has prayed for quashing and setting aside the communication dated 21st February 2014, issued by respondent no.3, and further sought directions to the respondents, to grant relaxation to the Recruitment Rules so as to give appointment to the son of the petitioner on compassionate ground.
3. We have gone through the pleadings in the petition, grounds taken therein, annexures thereto and also relevant policies of the Government reflected through Government Resolutions placed on record. The petitioner, who is already in the employment of respondent no.5, filed the application requesting therein for voluntary retirement and to appoint her son on compassionate ground as per recommendation of Lad

Committee Report. By the impugned communication, respondent no.3 refused to grant relaxation in recruitment on the ground that if such relaxation is granted, then other Municipal Council will also make same request.

4. We do not see any reason to interfere in the impugned communication and apprehension expressed by respondent no.3. In that view of the matter, no case is made out for interference in exercise of extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution. Hence, the petition is rejected.

(A.M. BADAR)
JUDGE

(S.S. SHINDE)
JUDGE

.....