

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 170/2016

(SHAILESH BANDU DARSHANWAR **VERSUS** M.S.R.T.C., CHANDRAPUR & ANOTHER)

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri S.R. Renu, counsel for the petitioner.
Ms Bhagyashri Reddy h/f Shri V.H. Kedar, counsel for the R-1.
Shri Khanzode h/f Shri D.K. Hazare, counsel for the R-2.

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

DATE : JUNE 30, 2016.

By this writ petition, the petitioner had sought a direction against the respondent no.1-Maharashtra State Road Transport Corporation to appoint the petitioner on compassionate ground.

A statement was made by the learned counsel for the Maharashtra State Road Transport Corporation on one of the previous dates of hearing the the Corporation is ready to grant compassionate appointment to one person from the family of the deceased but, since there is a dispute between the respondent no.2 and the petitioner and since both of them are claiming compassionate appointment, the appointment was not made.

The learned counsel for the petitioner and the respondent no.2 have presented an application for recording the compromise of the parties, in the Court, today.

The same is accepted on record.

We had talked to the petitioner and the respondent no.2 who were present in the Court, yesterday and we had found that they were ready to settle the dispute if the respondent no.2 was entitled to receive Family Pension and the petitioner gave 30% of the salary every month to the respondent no.2, who is incidently the legally wedded wife of the deceased from the re-marriage. The

parties had informed to this Court yesterday that they were *ad-idem* over the terms that would be mentioned in the compromise petition that would be presented in the Court today. Since they had expressed their inability to remain present today, we had recorded their presence and had also recorded their consent for the compromise terms.

We have read the terms of the compromise as are mentioned in Clause (a) to (f) of paragraph 3 of the application. The consent terms are just and reasonable. The respondent no.1- Maharashtra State Road Transport Corporation should appoint the petitioner on compassionate ground within a period of one month. The terms of the compromise would be binding on the petitioner and the respondent no.2.

We dispose of the writ petition in terms of the consent terms. No costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

APTE