

kps

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

WRIT PETITION NO.4575 OF 2014

SURESH NANA PATARE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

...
Shri Parag V. Barde, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Smt.S.D.Shelke, AGP, for Respondent Nos.1 to 4.
...

CORAM: RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.

DATE :- 14th August, 2015

Per Court:

1 Not on Board. Mentioned. Taken on the Supplementary Board.

2 Respondent No.4/ Shri Ganesh Rajaram Admankar, Assistant Executive Engineer Grade-1, Deolali Sub Division, Deolali Pravara DEO, Taluka Rahuri, District Ahmednagar, has filed an affidavit in reply dated 04.08.2015. The learned AGP points out paragraphs 3 and 4 of the said affidavit, which read as under:-

- “3. I say and submit that the petitioner has submitted information regarding the employees engaged by the respondents and some of them have been given the benefits of regularization. This fact is not disputed.
4. I say and submit that now as per G.R. Dated

24.04.2001, the petitioner is entitled for getting the benefits of permanency. I say that recently the petitioner has submitted the fresh proposal to the office of Respondents which is under consideration.”

3 The learned AGP, therefore, submits that the Government Resolution dated 24.04.2001 and the statement made by Respondent No.4 on oath would redress the grievance of the Petitioner. He is entitled for permanency as per the procedure set out in the Government Resolution and hence, this petition is rendered of an academic interest.

4 Shri Barde, learned Advocate for the Petitioner, considering the statement made in the affidavit in reply reproduced above and the Government Resolution dated 24.04.2001 placed on record, submits on instructions that, this Writ Petition can be disposed of as the Respondents would be considering the claim of the Petitioner for regularization.

5 In the light of the above, this Writ Petition is disposed of. Rule is discharged.

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)