

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

WRIT PETITION NO.12019 OF 2015

Prof. Agarchand S/o Shamrao Patil. ..PETITIONER

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
and Others. ..RESPONDENTS.

...

WRIT PETITION NO.12020 OF 2015

Prof. Arun S/o. Yashvantrao Mahajan. ..PETITIONER

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
and Others. ..RESPONDENTS.

...

WRIT PETITION NO.12021 OF 2015

Prof. Hiralal S/o Zinga Patil. ..PETITIONER

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
and Others. ..RESPONDENTS.

...

WRIT PETITION NO.12034 OF 2015

Dr. Bhimrao S/o Rambhau Ahirrao ..PETITIONER

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
and Others. ..RESPONDENTS.

...

WRIT PETITION NO.12014 OF 2015

Prof. Bhimrao S/o. Bhaurao Pawar. ..PETITIONER

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
and Others. ..RESPONDENTS.

...

WRIT PETITION NO.12033 OF 2015

Prof. Vidya W/o Laxman Rane. ..PETITIONER

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
and Others. ..RESPONDENTS.

...

Mr. Paresh B.Patil, Advocate for Petitioners;

Mr. A.V.Deshmukh, Mr.S.B.Yawalkar, Mr.D.R.Kale, AGPs in
respective petitions.

Mr.A.S.Sawant, Advocate for Respondent No.5 in WP
Nos.12019/2015 and 12034/2015

**CORAM : S.S.SHINDE &
P.R.BORA,JJ.**

DATE : 1st February, 2016.

PER COURT :

1) Heard. Since the issue involved in these
petitions is identical, those are being disposed of
by this common order.

2) By these petitions, the petitioners seek

directions to Respondent Nos.1 to 3 to pay salary for the period from 1.5.2012 to 31.8.2012; 1.4.2013 to 11.7.2013; 1.7.2013 to 31.10.2013; 1.6.2013 to 25.7.2013; 1.6.2013 to 30.09.2013 and 1.10.2011 to 31.7.2012 respectively.

3) The respondents have filed affidavit in reply, wherein it is stated that for the period from 1.5.2012 to 7.8.2012; 1.4.2013 to 11.7.2013; 1.7.2013 to 31.10.2013; 1.6.2013 to 30.09.2013; and 1.10.2011 to 17.7.2012, as per the record maintained by the office of the respondents, the petitioners did not work. Since no affidavit in reply is filed in WP No. 12034/2015, it is not clear as to for how much period the petitioner in the said writ petition did not work.

. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that, the management has certified that for the said period, the petitioners have rendered their services. In our opinion, since contradictory stands are taken, it is not possible for this Court to enter into the disputed questions of fact and adjudicate the issue raised in these petitions. In that view of the matter, in case the concerned college has certified

that the petitioners have rendered the services, the petitioners may be entitled to claim salary for the said period from the concerned college, where the petitioners have rendered their services.

4) With the above observations, the petitions stand disposed of.

(P.R.BORA)
JUDGE

(S.S.SHINDE)
JUDGE

bdv/