

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO. 1539 OF 2017

1. Vachhala Baburao Samshete
Age: 56 years, Occu.: Peon,
R/o c/o Marathwada Apang Training Center,
P-67, MIDC, Latur.
2. Mahadeo Shivdas Ghadge
Age: 56 years, Occu.: Peon,
R/o as above.
3. Kisan Vitthalrao Kadam
Age: 50 years, Occu.: Helper,
R/o as above.
4. Vajirkhan Ismail Khan Pathan
Age: 50 years, Occu.: Helper,
R/o as above.
5. Anil Manikrao Dange
Age: 50 years, Occu.: Peon,
R/o as above.

..PETITIONERS

VERSUS

1. State of Maharashtra
Social Justice and Welfare
Cultural Affairs, Sports and Tourism Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai.
Through its Secretary.
2. The Commissioner for Handicap Welfare,
Maharashtra State, Pune.
3. The Deputy Regional Commissioner,
Social Welfare Department,
Latur.

4. The District Social Welfare Officer,
Z.P. Latur, Dist. Latur.
5. Marathwada Apang Prashikshan Kendra,
P-67, M.I.D.C., Latur,
Through Administrator/District Social
Welfare Officer, Z.P. Latur, Dist. Latur.
6. Marathwada Apang Prashikshan Kendra
P-67, M.I.D.C., Latur,
Through Superintendent.

..RESPONDENTS

....
Mr. A.V. Indrale Patil, Advocate for petitioners.
Mr. V.S. Badkh, A.G.P. for Respondent Nos. 1 to 3.
Mr. D.B. Rode, Advocate for Respondent No.6.

....
**CORAM : ANOOP V. MOHTA &
SUNIL K. KOTWAL, JJ**
DATED : 05th JULY, 2017

ORAL JUDGMENT (Per : ANOOP V. MOHTA, J.)

1. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith and heard finally by consent of the parties.

2. On hearing the learned Counsel appearing for parties, we are inclined to dispose of present writ petition on the line of order passed in Writ Petition No. 1785 of 2017 (Rajesh Marutirao Suryawanshi Vs. State of Maharashtra and Others) passed by the Division Bench of this Court on 04th May, 2017. Petitioners are similarly situated non-teaching staff of Respondent No.6, against

whom this Court in above matter passed order. There is no issue that petitioners are similarly placed. Therefore following order :

O R D E R

- (i) Respondent No.4 – competent authority to take decision upon the proposal forwarded by Respondent No.6.
- (ii) Respondent No.6 to forward the proposal, if not already forwarded, within two weeks.
- (iii) Respondent No.4 – competent authority to take decision in accordance with law, as early as possible and preferably within a period of two months from the date of submission of fresh proposal, if any.
- (iv) Petition is allowed. Rule is made absolute accordingly. No costs.

(SUNIL K. KOTWAL, J.)

(ANOOP V. MOHTA, J.)

SSD