

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 8880 OF 2014
(Yamunabai Nimba Patil Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others)

Mr. Vinod P. Patil, Advocate for the Petitioner
Mr. S.D. Kaldate, A.G.P. for respondent Nos. 1 to 4
Mr. Pradip R. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 5

CORAM : S.S. SHINDE AND
SANGITRAO S. PATIL, JJ.
DATE : 1st AUGUST, 2016

PER COURT :

Heard.

2. Admittedly, the petitioner was dismissed from the service. In view of the provisions of Sub-Rule (3) of Rule 101 of the Maharashtra Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 1982, the petitioner is not even entitled for compassionate pension. The reliance placed by the learned counsel for the petitioner on Sub-Rule (1) of Rule 101 of the said Rules, is misplaced in the facts of this case inasmuch as the petitioner was not removed from service but he was dismissed from the service. In that view of the matter, no case is made out. The writ petition stands rejected.

[SANGITRAO S. PATIL]
JUDGE

[S.S. SHINDE]
JUDGE