

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 3669/2016

(AVINASH SHESHRAO PUSADEKAR **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)
 WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3670/2016

(RAVINDRA SHESHRAOJI ROKADE **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)
 WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3671/2016

(ANIL NANASAHEB BHAKARE **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)
 WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3672/2016

(GUNWANT MOTIRAMJI WAIDHANE **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)
 WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3673/2016

(KAVITA NATTHUJI GAWANDE **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)
 WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3674/2016

(RAVINDRA SHIVCHAND SUKHDEVE **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)
 WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3675/2016

(RANJANA SHYAMRAOJI REWATKAR **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)
 WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3676/2016

(RAVINDRA JAGDEORAO GIRI **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)
 WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3677/2016

(YASHMEEN BASHIRUDDIN KAZI **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)
 WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3678/2016

(VIJAY MAHADEORAO DESHMUKH **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)
 WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3679/2016

(MAHENDRA AMBADASJI VAIDHYA **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)
 WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3680/2016

(TARACHAND BHAAURAO KORDE **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)
 WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3681/2016

(SUDESH MAHADEVRAO THAKRE **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)
 WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3682/2016

(RAJESH WASUDEORAO RAUT **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)
 WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3683/2016

(PRAKASH WAMANRAO VINCHURKAR **VERSUS** C.E.O., Z.P. AMRAVATI & ANOTHER)

Shri P.S. Kshirsagar, counsel for the petitioners.

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

DATE : JULY 01, 2016.

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

By these writ petitions, the petitioners have sought a declaration that the petitioners cannot be declared as surplus in the month of May-2016 as they were not declared as surplus on 30.09.2015 as per the policy of the Government. The petitioners have sought an order restraining the respondents from absorbing the petitioners in some other schools in terms of the policy.

It is fairly stated on behalf of the petitioner that a communication of the State Government dated 13.06.2016, the State Government has directed the Chief Executive Officer of Zilla Parishad, Amravati that the process of absorption undertaken by the Zilla Parishad should be stopped as the Government has stayed the process with a view to consider the objections raised on behalf of the parties. It is stated that it is observed in the order dated 13.06.2016 that the staffing pattern as per the Right To Education is still not chalked and there are certain deficiencies, with the result that the process of absorption cannot be completed. The learned counsel for the petitioners states that the petitioners would approach the Secretary, Rural Development Department of the State Government before whom the complaints in respect of the process of absorption in various Zilla Parishads is pending and the grievance of the petitioners would be brought to the notice of the concerned department.

In any case, since we find that the petitions are premature as the process of absorption is itself stayed, we dispose of the writ petitions with no order as to costs. The petitioners are free to put up their grievance before the concerned authority.

The points raised in the petitions are kept open.

JUDGE

JUDGE

APTE