

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 4881 OF 2016
(Pralhad Chendiram Shelke Vs. The State of Maharashtra
and others)

Mr. Ulhas S. Sawji, Advocate for the Petitioner
Mr. V.H. Dighe, A.G.P. for the respondents

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

DATE : 10th JUNE, 2016

PER COURT :

1. Heard.

2. It is the submission of the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner that the text of Rule 58-A of the Maharashtra Police Manual, 1999, which is extracted in the impugned judgment, is not correct version and the Marathi version of the said Rule which is placed on record of the present petition at Annexure-C (Page Nos. 19 to 21) is correct one.

3. On going through the papers, we find that it was open for the petitioner to bring to the notice of

the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal the Marathi version of Rule 58-A which, according to the petitioner, is different than what is referred and quoted by the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal in the impugned judgment.

4. The another contention of the petitioner is that the respondents were bound to consider the seniority list separately for the Aurangabad Police Commissionerate. It has no basis as to Rule 58-A, which is quoted in the impugned judgment and therefore, we are not accepting the said submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. It appears from the careful reading of the impugned judgment that the petitioner did not dispute the State level seniority amongst the armourers. In that view of the matter, there is no ground for interference in the impugned judgment. In case the petitioner is of the opinion that some factual errors have been crept in the impugned judgment, it is for the petitioner to seek appropriate remedy before the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal.

6. With the above observations, the writ petition stands rejected.

[SANGITRAO S. PATIL]
JUDGE

[S.S. SHINDE]
JUDGE

npj/wp4881-2016