

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 3814 OF 2015

Balwant Ramrao Ambad .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and other .. Respondents

Shri V. M. Chate, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Ms. P. V. Diggikar, A.G.P. for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

Shri S. S. Chaudhari, Advocate h/f Shri Sameer S. Chaudhari,
Advocate for the Respondent No. 3.

Shri P. D. Suryawanshi, Advocate for the Respondent No. 4.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
K. L. WADANE, JJ.**

DATE : 30TH NOVEMBER, 2016.

PER COURT :

. We have heard Mr. Chate, the learned counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Chaudhari, the learned counsel for the Respondent No. 3, the learned Assistant Government for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2 and the learned counsel for the respondent No. 4.

2. The dispute appears to be with regard to the payment of salary of the petitioner. According to Mr. Chate, the learned counsel, the petitioner has worked from 2008 to 2014, however, salary has not been paid to the petitioner. The petitioner is

entitled to salary as per the pay scale of Rs. 9300-34800 with grade pay of Rs. 4600/-. Even proposals are submitted from time to time.

3. Mr. Chaudhary, the learned counsel for the respondent No. 3 submits that, the petitioner for the first time has worked from June 2011 to April 2014 on clock hour basis and was paid consolidated amount of Rs. 50,000/-.

4. The learned counsel for the respondent No. 4 also adopts the arguments of Mr. Chaudhary, the learned counsel for the respondent No. 3.

5. We have also heard the learned Assistant Government Pleader for respondents/State.

6. The dispute appears to be with regard to duties being performed by the petitioner from June 2008 to September 2014 as junior lecturer in junior college.

7. There are rival contentions in this regard. According to respondents the petitioner has worked on clock hour basis from June 2011 to April 2014 and was paid consolidated amount of Rs. 50,000/-. Whereas as per the petitioner, the petitioner has worked on full time basis from June 2008 to September 2014.

The record will have to be considered, which would include various documents and disputed questions.

8. It would be appropriate to refer the parties to the Deputy Director of Education, Aurangabad Region, Aurangabad to consider the record and take decision accordingly.

9. Considering the above, we pass following order.

10. The petitioner may give application/representation to the respondent No. 1 giving details about his claim. The respondent No. 1 after hearing respondent Nos. 3 and 4 and considering the entire record of the respondent Nos. 3 and 4 and the documents which would be submitted by the petitioner and respondents shall take decision expeditiously and preferably within a period of six (06) months from the date of receipt of application/representation from the petitioner. The writ petition accordingly is disposed of. No costs.

[K. L. WADANE, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]