

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**BENCH AT AURANGABAD****WRIT PETITION NO. 10817 OF 2015**

GULAB EKNATHRAO PATIL AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Barlinge S.R.
AGP for Respondent/State : Mr. S.R. Yadav Lonikar
Advocate for Respondent no.6 : Mr. Talhar Ajay G.

...

CORAM : S.S. SHINDE & P.R. BORA, JJ.

Dated: November 18, 2015

...

PER COURT :-

This Petition takes exception to the inter-se communication (at Exhibit-E), between the Director of Education (Primary), Maharashtra State, Pune and the respondent no.1 herein.

2. In our opinion, the Petition is premature. As and when the petitioners or the school in which the petitioners are serving, receives any notice or communication from the concerned competent authority for termination of the services of the petitioners, it will be open for the concern/affected parties to take appropriate remedy, as may be available in law.

3. So far grievance of the petitioners for payment

of salary for the services, which they have already rendered, and to that effect if proposals are already submitted by the Management, we direct the Respondent no.3 to take decision on the said proposal, in accordance with relevant rules/procedure, as expeditiously as possible, however, preferably within 8 weeks from today.

4. Needless to observe, the concerned authority will be entitled to verify the factual details about actual services rendered etc., of each of the petitioners. In case, the petitioners are found entitled for the salary, respondent no.3 shall ensure that, the petitioners receive salary within four weeks from decision on the proposal submitted by the management.

5. With above observations, the Petition stands rejected. Rejection of this Petition would not be construed as an impediment to the petitioners, so as to seek appropriate remedy before the appropriate forum in case they receive the individual notices for terminating their services.

(P.R. BORA, J.)

(S.S. SHINDE, J.)

...