

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 2942 OF 2016
(Abdul Baree Abdul Latif Vs. The State of Maharashtra
and others)

Mr. Girish Nagori, Advocate for the Petitioner
Mr. P.N. Kutti, A.G.P. for respondent No.1/State

CORAM : S.S. SHINDE AND
SANGITRAO S. PATIL, JJ.

DATE : 20th JUNE, 2016

PER COURT :

1. Heard.

2. We are not inclined to entertain this petition in view of the fact that the petitioner will have liberty to reply to notice. All the contentions raised in this petition can be taken in the reply to the notice and during the enquiry. In that view of the matter, the writ petition stands rejected.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in respect of the recovery of the amount paid towards salary, etc. for the period for which the petitioner has already rendered services, notice is

issued by the respondents. In that regard, the petitioner would be at liberty to avail the appropriate remedy. With these observations, the writ petition stands rejected.

[SANGITRAO S. PATIL]
JUDGE

[S.S. SHINDE]
JUDGE

npj/wp2942-2016