

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

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 689 OF 2016
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 9923 OF 2014**

Rajeev Prabhakarrrao Terkhedkar
and others

.. Petitioners

Versus

The Union of India and others

.. Respondents

Shri U. R. Awate, Advocate h/f Talekar and Associates, Advocate
for Petitioners.

Ms. S. S. Raut, A.G.P. for the Respondent No. 2.

Shri Deelip Bankar Patil, Advocate for the Respondent No. 3.

Shri K. B. Jadhavar, Advocate for the Respondent No. 4.

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

DATE : 18TH NOVEMBER, 2016.

PER COURT :

. Mr. Bankar Patil, the learned counsel for the respondent No. 3 submits that, the order passed by this Court is complied and the petitioners have been issued fresh appointment orders. According to Mr. Awate, the learned counsel for petitioners, it cannot be fresh appointments, as the petitioners are working since long time. The same can be considered while dealing with the writ petition.

2. In view of the fact that, the petitioners have been taken back in service and considering the explanation given in affidavit, we refrain from taking any further action in the contempt petition.

3. The contempt petition as such is disposed of keeping the point raised by the present petitioners that, appointments could not be fresh appointments open. No costs.

[K. L. WADANE, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]