

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET No.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

C.A.W. NO.157/2016 IN W.P. NO. 6131/2004 (D)

(MANOJ GANGADHARRAO KAYARKAR **VERSUS** PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS
JUDGE – DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY, CHANDRAPUR)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Ms. Aarti Singh, counsel for the applicant/petitioner.
Shri A.M. Kukday, counsel for the non-applicant/respondent.

CORAM : SMT.VASANTI A. NAIK AND
PRASANNA B. VARALE, JJ.

DATE : FEBRUARY 26, 2016.

We have heard the learned counsel for the applicant as also the non-applicant. We find that in view of our order dated 08.05.2015, by which we had asked the non-applicant-Principal District and Sessions Judge, Chandrapur to consider the case of the petitioner sympathetically and take a decision in the matter, the non-applicant-Principal District and Sessions Judge, Chandrapur sought to review the order that was challenged in the writ petition on the terms stated in the order dated 18.06.2015. The terms mentioned in the order dated 18.06.2015 were agreeable to the petitioner and, hence, the writ petition was disposed of by the order dated 02.07.2015 in terms of the order of the non-applicant-Disciplinary Authority, dated 18.06.2015 with the consent of the learned counsel for the parties. In the aforesaid set of facts, it cannot be said that the Condition Nos.1(iii) and 1(iv) in the order dated 18.06.2015 could not have been imposed while reinstating the applicant in service with continuity in service.

There is no scope for either reviewing the order dated 02.07.2015 or giving any clarification in respect of the conditions in the order dated 18.06.2015.

The civil application stands rejected.

JUDGE

JUDGE

APTE