

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO.2939/2016
Dayanand s/o Ramkrishna Dhargave

...Versus...

Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Company Ltd., Mumbai – 400051 and
another

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.3210/2016
Makrand s/o Chandrakant Phule

...Versus...

Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Company Ltd., Mumbai – 400051 and
another

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri A.M. Sudame, Advocate for petitioner in both petitions
Shri D.M. Kale, Advocate for respondents in both petitions

CORAM : SMT. VASANTI A. NAIK AND
MRS. SWAPNA JOSHI, JJ.
DATE : 16.11.2016

Since the issue involved in these writ petitions is identical, they are heard together and are decided by this common order.

By these writ petitions, the petitioners challenge the order of the Executive Engineer, Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission Company Limited, dated 20.5.2016 reverting the petitioners on the post of Deputy Executive Engineer.

Shri Kale, the learned Counsel for the respondents states that an identical issue like the one involved in these petitions came up for consideration before the Division Bench at the Principal Seat in a bunch of writ petitions bearing Writ

Petition No.5995/2016 and others and by the judgment, dated 24.10.2016, the writ petitions are dismissed. It is stated that on parity, it would be necessary to dismiss these writ petitions also.

Shri Sudame, the learned Counsel for the petitioners does not dispute the statement made by the learned Counsel for the respondents and fairly admits that identical petitions are dismissed by the Division Bench at the Principal Seat by the judgment, dated 24.10.2016. It is stated that by the judgment dated 24.10.2016, the petitioners were granted liberty to make a representation to justify the experience certificate submitted by them along with their recruitment application and the respondents were directed to decide the representation within a period of ten weeks. It is stated that a similar order could be passed, in these petitions also.

Hence, for the reasons recorded in the judgment dated 24.10.2016 passed by the Division Bench at the Principal Seat in a bunch of writ petitions bearing Writ Petition No.5995/2016 and others we dismiss these writ petitions. We, however, grant liberty to the petitioners to make a fresh representation along with the relevant material to justify the experience certificate submitted by them along with the recruitment application, within a period of two weeks, and if such a representation is made, we direct the respondents to decide the same within ten weeks.

Order accordingly. No costs.

JUDGE

Wadkar

JUDGE