

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

PUBLIC INTEREST LITIGATION NO. 35 OF 2014

Bhaskar Mahadev Ware

...PETITIONER

versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

...RESPONDENTS

.....

Mr. Vikram S. Undre, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. S.S. Dande, AGP for respondents No. 1 to 3

Mr. K.J. Ghute, Patil, Advocate for respondents No. 4 and 5

Mr. N.B. Khandare, Advocate for respondent No. 6

Mr. G.J. Kore, Advocate for respondents No. 9 and 10

Mr. S.V. Deshmukh, Advocate for respondents No. 11 and 14

.....

**CORAM : R.M. BORDE AND
K.K. SONAWANE, JJ.**

DATED : 25th OCTOBER, 2016.

Order :-

1. Affidavit in-reply has been presented on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3 wherein it has been stated that the Collector has issued show cause notice to respondents No. 7 and 8 on 11-02-2014. Departmental Enquiry is also initiated against respondents No. 9 and 10, who were working as Talathi in the village at the relevant time. It is further stated that in pursuance of show cause notice issued to respondents No. 7 and 8, they have submitted their respective explanation and it was not found unsatisfactory. Therefore, it was recommended that departmental enquiry be initiated against respondent No. 7, but during intervening period respondent No. 7 retired and a proposal for initiating departmental enquiry has been sent

to the State Government through the Divisional Commissioner, Aurangabad.

2. It is further stated that insofar as respondent No. 8 is concerned, she has tendered her explanation and the Government Authorities have taken decision to accept her explanation and not to proceed against her and warning has been issued to her that she should not commit similar acts in future. Similarly, so far as respondents No. 9 and 10 are concerned, who are working as Talathi, departmental enquiries/proceedings had been initiated against them and warning has been issued to them that they should not indulge in similar activities in future.

3. In view of affidavit-in-reply filed by respondents No. 1 to 3, it does appear that purpose of present Public Interest Litigation has been served.

4. In this view of the matter, Public Interest Litigation stands disposed of.

[K. K. SONAWANE, J.]

[R.M. BORDE, J.]

MTK