IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.10145 OF 2014

Ujwale Ganesh Sadhu & Ors. ... Petitioners
Vs.
State of Maharashtra & anr. ... Respondents

a/w
WRIT PETITION NO.7461 OF 2014

Manisha Dnyaneshwar Anjikhane & anr. ... Petitioners
Vs.
State of Maharashtra & anr. ... Respondents

Mr.Surel S. Shah for the Petitioners
Mr.Vikas Mali, Assistant Government Pleader, for Respondent Nos.1 & 2

CORAM: **SMT. VASANTI A. NAIK &**
SHRI C.V. BHADANG, JJ.

DATE: **27th JANUARY, 2015**

P.C.:

Heard.

The learned Counsel for the petitioners states that the issue involved in these cases was also involved in Writ Petition No.2046 of 2010 and the Nagpur Bench of the Bombay High Court had, by the judgment dated 19.10.2013 partly allowed the writ petition and directed the respondents to regularise the services and confer the permanency on such petitioners, who have completed 3 years' service with technical breaks. It is stated that by the said judgment, the High Court has protected the petitioners, who

were in continuous employment. The learned Counsel states that a similar order may be passed in these cases also and the respondents may be directed to pay the regular salary from 1.2.2015.

Mr.Mali, the learned Assistant Government Pleader, appearing on behalf of the respondent Nos.1 and 2, does not dispute the statement made on behalf of the petitioners.

Hence, for the reasons recorded in the judgment dated 19.10.2013 in Writ Petition No.2046 of 2010, we partly allow these writ petitions and direct the respondents to regularise the services and confer permanency on such petitioners, who have completed 3 years of service with technical breaks and who are still in service. The respondents are directed to absorb the petitioners within a period of 6 weeks and pay the regular salary to the petitioners from the date of their absorption. Just like the order passed in the Writ Petition No.2046 of 2010, though we direct the respondents to grant continuity of service to the petitioners, we make it clear that the petitioners would not be entitled to claim any monetary benefits towards the past services rendered by them.

Order accordingly. No order as to costs.

(C.V. BHADANG, J.) **(VASANTI A. NAIK, J.)**