

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.31 OF 2016 IN
WRIT PETITION NO.2924 OF 2014

Pratibha Dinkar Sonawane @
Archana Sunil Patil

Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & others

Respondents

Mrs.Sabahat T. Kazi, advocate for the petitioner.
Mr.V.S.Badakh, A.G.P. For Respondents No.1, 3 & 4.
Respondent No.2 served.

WITH
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.32 OF 2016 IN
WRIT PETITION NO.2925 OF 2014

Hemraj s/o Ravindra Patil

Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & others

Respondents

Mrs.Sabahat T. Kazi, advocate for the petitioner.
Mr.V.S.Badakh, A.G.P. For Respondents No.1, 3 & 4.
Respondent No.2 served.

WITH
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.27 OF 2016 IN
WRIT PETITION NO.2922 OF 2014

Ulhas s/o Prakash Suryawanshi

Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & others

Respondents

Mrs.Sabahat T. Kazi, advocate for the petitioner.
Mr.V.S.Badakh, A.G.P. For Respondents No.1 & 3 to 5.
Respondent No.2 served.

**CORAM : R.M.BORDE AND
A.M.DHAVAL, JJ.
DATE : 02nd August, 2017.**

P.C. :

1 Petitioners are alleging willful disobedience of the orders passed by this Court on 12.08.2015 in W.P.No.2924 of 2014 and two other companion matters.

2 This Court, while disposing of the aforesaid writ petitions, directed the Director of Education (Primary) to pass fresh orders as regards absorption of the petitioners. It was observed that the petitioners will be entitled to continuity of service. It was directed that with regard to payment of salary for the interregnum period, the Director of Education (Primary) shall pass fresh orders within a period of three months.

3 Learned A.G.P. informs that the Director of Education (Primary) is not entrusted with the powers to take decision in the matter as regards absorption of the petitioners and the powers are invested with the State Government. It is further contended that a proposal has been tendered by the Director of Education (Primary) to the State Government for consideration and the said proposal is pending.

4 On prior occasion, when the Contempt Petitions were taken up for consideration in the month of June 2016, a statement

was made on behalf of Respondent-State Government that approximately four months period would be required for taking appropriate decision in the matter by the State Government. However, in spite of lapse of period of more than one year, no decision has been taken by the State Government.

5 In these circumstances, we direct Respondent-State Government to take appropriate decision in the matter in consonance with the directions issued by this Court on 12.08.2015 in Writ Petition No.2924/2014 with companion matters, within four months from today.

6 Petitioners contend that they have not been paid arrears of salary. It would be the responsibility of the respondents to pay the amount of arrears, as directed by this Court.

7 In this view of the matter, Contempt Petitions stand disposed of.

A.M.DHAVALÉ
JUDGE

adb/CP3116

R.M.BORDE
JUDGE