

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 3968 OF 2016

VASANT SAMPATRAO MUNDE
VERSUS
THE UNION OF INDIA AND ANOHER

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. R.D. Biradar
Advocate for respondents. :Mr. A.G. Talhar.

CORAM : S.V. GANGAPURWALA &
K.K. SONAWANE, JJ.

DATE : 15th APRIL, 2016.

PER COURT:

1] Heard. Mr. Biradar, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was nominated as Director of the respondent No.2 vide order dated 13.1.2014. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner was nominated for a term of two years. However, vide amendment dated 13.5.2015 in Section 10, the said term of Director is made 3 years. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner would be governed by the amended provision, as such, removal of the petitioner as Director is incorrect and illegal.

2] Mr. Talhar, learned counsel submits that term of the petitioner as nominated director was for a period of 2 years and that was to come to end. The petitioner was nominated at the pleasure of the Government. The order nominating the petitioner as Director is crystal clear. The said appointment is for a period of 2 years or until further orders whichever is earlier. The period of two years came to an end on 14th January, 2016. In the light of that, the petitioner does not have any vested right to continue as Director. Said period of two years has also lapsed. Petitioner would be governed by the letter nominating him as Director. Even otherwise, the State has exercised its power. Tenure of the petitioner was at the pleasure of

the Government. The amended provision would be of no avail to the petitioner, as the nomination was for a period of two years or until further order whichever is earlier. In the light of the above, writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

[K.K. SONAWANE,J.]

[S.V.GANGAPURWALA,J]

grt/-