

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO.1505 OF 2015

[Ku. Shradha Rajabhau Jagtap .vs. State of Maharashtra and others]

 Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
 appearances, Court's orders of directions
 and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri P.S. Khubalkar, counsel for the petitioner,
 Shri D.M. Kale, AGP for the respondent nos.1 to 3,
 Shri D.M. Surjuse, counsel for the respondent no.4.

.....

CORAM : SMT. VASANTI A. NAIK AND
A.I.S. CHEEMA, JJ.

DATED : AUGUST 20, 2015.

Heard.

By this petition, the petitioner challenges the communication of the respondent no.2, dated 7.2.2015 refusing to grant approval to the appointment of the petitioner on the post of Lady Superintendent.

The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the issue involved in this case was also involved in a bunch of writ petitions bearing Writ Petition No.4141/2013 and others and this court has, by an order dated 21.10.2013, partly allowed the writ petitions and directed the Additional Commissioner to reconsider the proposals of the petitioners therein in the light of the Government Circular dated 18.10.2013, within a time frame. It is stated that in the said writ petitions, this court directed the respondents to release the arrears of salary to the petitioners, if it was found that they were entitled to approval.

The statement made by the learned counsel for the petitioner is not disputed by the learned counsel for the respondents. It is admitted that the issue involved in this case stands partly answered in favour of the petitioner in view of order dated 21.10.2013 in Writ

Petition No.4141/2013 and others.

Hence, for the reasons recorded in the order, dated 21.10.2013 in Writ Petition No.4141/2013 and others, we partly allow this writ petition. The impugned order is quashed and set aside. The respondent no.2-Additional Commissioner is directed to reconsider the proposal of the petitioner in the light of the Government Circular dated 18.10.2013, within a period of 15 days and if it is found that the petitioner is entitled to approval, the respondents should release the salary of the petitioner within a period of one month thereafter.

The writ petition is disposed of with the aforesaid directions, with no order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Gulande