

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 2060/2014.

Shital Ravishankar Dhirde

-VERSUS-

State of Maharashtra and others.

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders

**CORAM : B.P.DHARMADHIKARI
& P.N. DESHMUKH, JJ.**

DATE : OCTOBER 06, 2015.

We have heard Shri P.A. Gode, learned Counsel for the petitioner, Ms. Hiwase, learned A.G.P. for respondent no.1, Shri B.G. Kulkarni, learned counsel for respondent no.2, Shri N.A. Gaikwad, learned Counsel for respondent no.3. Shri N.B. Kirtane, learned counsel who appears for respondent no.4 is stated to be not available.

2. It is not in dispute that the controversy is covered by orders dated 02.07.2010 in Writ Petition No. 1489/2010 and other connected matters, reported at **2010 (4) Mh.L.J. 572 (Sudhir Sharadrao Hunge**

and another .vrs. State of Maharashtra and others.)

3. In view of this, while issuing notice on 08.05.2014, we have passed the following order :

“ Heard learned Advocate Shri P.A. Gode for the petitioner and learned Advocate Shri N.A. Gaikwad for respondent No.1/Caveator.

Learned Advocate Shri Gaikwad has tendered reply-affidavit. It is taken on record.

In reply-affidavit respondent no.4 Management states that the proposal of the petitioner will be forwarded to respondent no.2 within three weeks. Learned Advocate Shri Gode submits that the grievance of petitioner will be partly redressed, if that proposal is considered by respondent no.2/University in time bound manner.

In this situation, we direct respondent no.4 to forward the proposal accordingly, within three weeks from today. Respondent no.2 shall consider that proposal in accordance with law, within further period of three weeks.

Notice, returnable on 01.07.2014.

Learned AGP Shri Patil, waives service of notice for respondent No.1.

Hamdast for respondent nos. 2 and 4.

Recruitment, if any, in pursuance

3

to advertisement dated 26.12.2013 shall be subject to the further orders of this Court in the matter.”

4. The proposal so forwarded by the respondent no.3 Management could not be considered by the respondent no.1 University, as petitioner has sent a letter seeking approval of earlier University, namely Nagpur University.

5. In this situation, we direct the respondent no.2 University to consider that proposal in accordance with law, within next two months.

6. Writ Petition is partly allowed and disposed of. No costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

Rgd.