

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

Writ Petition No. 6410 of 2013

District : Ahmednagar

Swastik Mahila Mandal,
Pathardi, Taluka : Pathardi,
District : Ahmednagar,
Through its President,
Sapna Rameshwar Ladda,
Age : 30 years,
Occupation : Social Worker,
R/o. Kasar Lane, Pathardi,
Taluka : Pathardi,
District : Ahmednagar.

.. Petitioner.

versus

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through its Secretary,
Women & Child Welfare Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai - 32.
 2. Member Secretary,
Maharashtra State Women Commission,
Grahnirman Bhavan (MHADA Building),
Potmala, Bandra (E), Mumbai-51.
 3. The Commissioner,
Women & Child Development,
Maharashtra State, Pune.
 4. District Women & Child
Development Officer,
Ahmednagar,
District : Ahmednagar.
- .. Respondents.

.....

*Mr. Manoj Dond, Advocate, holding for
Mr. S.D. Kotkar, Advocate, for the petitioner.*

*Mr. S.G. Karlekar, Asst. Government Pleader,
for respondent nos.1, 3 and 4.*

Respondent no.2 served (Absent).

.....

**CORAM : S.V. GANGAPURWALA &
A.M. BADAR, JJ.**

DATE : 3RD MARCH 2016

PER COURT :

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and the learned Asst. Government Pleader for respondent nos.1, 3 and 4. None present for respondent no.2 though served.

2. Grievance of the petitioner is that the respondent no.2 has not taken any decision on the proposal recommended by respondent no.4 vide its covering letter dated 14/22-11-2011.

3. Affidavit in reply has been filed by the State. In fact, the petition is filed based on earlier proposal. In the first round i.e. of the year 2011, the petitioner was at Serial No.3. Thereafter advertisement is issued on 17-8-2012. Pursuant to the said advertisement also, the petitioner had applied. The same was considered. The petitioner was at Serial No.2 and at Serial No.1 was NGO, namely, Sant Janabai Mahila Mandal at Pathardi and Counselling Centre is granted to them.

4. In the light of the above, grievance of the petitioner does not survive. In case, the petitioner is aggrieved by the subsequent decision, the petitioner is at liberty to assail the same in accordance with law.

5. The Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

(A.M. BADAR)
JUDGE

(S.V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE

.....