

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 5231 OF 2015

JAIDEEP SHANKARRAO BORGAONKAR
VERSUS
STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Vishwas B.Wagh.
AGP for Respondent/ State : Mr. S. K. Kadam.
Advocate for Respondent No.4 : Mr. V.S. Panpatte.

CORAM : S.S. SHINDE & A.M. BADAR,JJ.
DATE : 29TH SEPTEMBER,2015.

PER COURT:

1] Heard. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that the impugned order is stigmatic inasmuch as, the said order is passed without giving opportunity to the petitioner or without adhering to the procedure prescribed and, therefore, relying upon the pleadings of the petition, grounds taken therein, and the conditions stipulated while appointing the petitioner, he submits that petition may be allowed.

2] We have heard the learned AGP for respondent State and learned counsel for respondent No. 4. Learned counsel for respondent No. 4 invited our attention to the conditions mentioned in the appointment letter itself and submits that the appointment of the petitioner was for 11 months with clear indication that in case of discontinuation of the services of the petitioner, the same will be without notice to the petitioner.

3] It appears from the material placed on record that though the petitioner was given opportunity to explain, the petitioner did not respond. IN that view of the matter and in view of the fact that the petitioner was appointed for 11 months on contractual basis, we do not see any reason to invoke extraordinary jurisdiction and entertain the petition. Petition sans merit is rejected.

[A.M. BADAR, J]

[S.S. SHINDE, J]

grt/-