

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

CAO NO. 1004/2015 AND MCA ST. NO. 24550/2014 IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 1286 OF 2013

(Vilas s/o Baburao Lakhdive & Anr. vs. State of Maharashtra thr. its Secretary, General
Administrative Department & Anr.)

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 &
Z.A. HAQ, JJ.
AUGUST 28, 2015.**

Heard Shri Raut, learned counsel for the
applicants/ petitioners.

The prayer is to condone delay of 295 days
in filing MCA St. No. 24550 of 2014.

In the facts of this case, before issuing
notice, we have attempted to find out whether there is
any merit in the proposed revision application/ MCA.
Writ Petition No. 1286 of 2013 filed by present review
applicants has been disposed of on 21.01.2014 by this
Court after hearing the learned counsel then
representing them. This Court directed Chief Executive
Officer (employer) to hear all the concerned and then
to pass fresh orders. Accordingly, CEO has passed fresh
orders.

Now, through another counsel, the review
applicants are before this Court contending that the
CEO has gone by directions of this Court in an earlier
writ petition filed by persons who have become senior,
in the cadre of Superintendent, to these applicants/
petitioners. It is submitted that in that writ petition

the present applicants had filed a civil application and as that civil application has not been disposed of, the rights of these applicants (petitioners in Writ Petition No. 1286 of 2013) have been violated.

This Court while disposing of the writ petition on 21.01.2014 found that promotions given to present petitioners were not substantive or permanent. The grievance was not then raised that any other civil application filed by these petitioners/ applicants was pending or needed consideration. It is not in dispute that CEO has obeyed the orders dated 21.01.2014 and has passed further orders.

In this situation, we find the review application misconceived. As such, there is no question of issuing notice. Both the applications are disposed of.

JUDGE

JUDGE

*GS.