IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 5162 OF 2004
WITH
CA/8032/2006 IN WP/5162/2004
WITH
CA/1409/2008 IN WP/5162/2004

MAHA PADVIDHAR ANSHKALIN KARMACHARI WELFARE
ASSOCITION THROUGH ITS VICE PRESIDENT
VERSUS
STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & OTHERS
...
WITH
CA/5296/2008 IN WP/5162/2004

SUJITKUMAR UDEBHAN CHAVAN AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
CA/5297/2008 IN WP/5162/2004

NANDKISHOR BAJIRAO INGLE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
CA/5298/2008 IN WP/5162/2004

MAHENDRA BHAUDAS KHOBRAGADE AND OTHERS.
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
CA/5299/2008 IN WP/5162/2004

PASPULWAR VENKATESH RAJARAM AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA.

WITH
CA/5300/2008 IN WP/5162/2004

TUKARAM ANNADA SURYAWANSHI AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.
...

WITH
CA/5301/2008 IN WP/5162/2004

DINESHKUMAR GAURISHANKAR AVASTHI AND OTHERS.
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
CA/1249/2012 IN WP/5162/2004

MAHARASHTRA PADVIDHAR ANSHKALIN KARMACHARI WELFEARE ASSOCIATION, NAGPUR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.
...
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.11274/2012 IN WP 5162/2004

DEEPAK RAGHUNATHJI BANKAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WP/2115/2005
WITH
CA/9774/2006 IN WP/2115/2005

HANMANT BABURAO DESHMUKH AND OTHERS.
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/3938/2004

MILIND DASHRATH SABLE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/4931/2004

SMT MANGAL RAOSAHEB DESHMUKH
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5146/2004

NANDU MARUTI KUTE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5147/2004

YOGANAND CHINCHONE AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5148/2004

SUNIL RAJNARSU PARIPELLI
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5150/2004

VIJU BHAURAO DINDE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHRS.

WITH
WP/5152/2004

SAYYAD NISAR SAYYED MAHBOOB AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5153/2004

TRIMBAK LAXMAN PATEKAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5154/2004

MADHUKAR ASHROBA VARHADE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5155/2004

ABARAO TUKARAM CHAVAN
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH

WP/5157/2004
KADUJI RAMBHAU NARVADE AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5158/2004

VILAS TRIMBAKRAO BHALERAO AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5159/2004
SANJAY NAGNATH AKOLE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

WITH
WP/5160/2004
RITESH JAIPRAKASH ASAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5163/2004

SMT JAISHRI BHAWANRAO KOKAD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5164/2004

JEEVAN DADARAO KADAM
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5165/2004

JANARDHAN GYANABE DUGANE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5166/2004

SANJAYKUMAR PANDHARINATH KADAM
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5167/2004

UTTAM MOTIRAM NAGARGOJE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5168/2004

BHUJANG BALIRAM KOLHE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5169/2004

PRAYAG JALBA SONKAMBLE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5170/2004

SUBHASH CHHATRU RATHOD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/5252/2009

RAVINDRA LAXMAN POLASWAR AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/6271/2004

SHRINIWAS HARIBHAU KHAIRE AND OTHERS.
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

WITH
WP/6384/2004
PRABHAKAR MURLIDHAR PHATANGALE AND OTHERS.
VERSUS
STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. S B Talekar
AGP for Respondents: Miss S.S. Raut
Mr. Y.R.Barhate h/f Mr. Bhagwat Shinde Advocate for Resp Z.P in WP 5165, 5166,5167,5168/2004

...

...

CORAM : A.V. NIRGUDE & V.K. JADHAV, JJ.
Dated: October 20, 2015

...

PER COURT :-

1. All these petitions now deserves to be disposed of in view of developments that took place after the year 2004. The petitioners are the representatives of persons who were part time employees of State of Maharashtra. A scheme was floated by the State of Maharashtra to provide part time employment to deserving unemployed graduate candidates. For some year, scheme was implemented and part time employment was provided to thousands of unemployed youth. On 27.10.2009 the Government of Maharashtra passed a resolution and indicated that they would provide 10% horizontal reservation to the class of candidates who had worked for the Government as per the scheme referred to above. The petitioners expressed their grievance that despite of resolution of 2009, their class is neglected. This Court vide order dated 6.1.2012 directed the State of Maharashtra to file an affidavit or explaining the following points.

1. As to whether all the departments of the State Government have been directed to provide 10% horizontal reservation for the part time workers category.

2. as to whether in the recruitment process, carried out after 27.10.2009, recruitment agencies have scrupulously followed the Government resolution dated 27.10.2009 or not;

3. as to how many posts have been in fact reserved in the recruitment process carried out after 27.10.2009 for the posts to be filled in from part time workers; and

4. as to whether in fact how many such part time workers have been granted employment.

2. We found that most of the grievances of the petitioners are redressed. Several steps are taken to ensure that class of petitioners would be provided 10% horizontal reservation in terms of the resolution dated 27.10.2009. We are also came across several advertisements in which reservation was provided. Petitions thus have served their purpose and we are now disposing them of. We made it clear at the request of the learned counsel for the petitioners that, in case, the petitioners come across any incident which would amount to breach of promise given by the State of Maharashtra through its resolution of 2009, they are free to make complaint about it to this Court and the

Court would take appropriate steps in that regard.

3. Writ Petitions thus disposed of. No costs.

4. In view of disposal of writ petitions, all pending civil applications stand disposed of accordingly.

(V.K. JADHAV, J.) **(A.V. NIRGUDE, J.)**

...

aaa/-