

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.8829 OF 2012
(Archana Raosaheb Tambe Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others)

Mr.S.K.Tambe, AGP for State.

(CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE AND
SUNIL K. KOTWAL, J.J.)

DATE : 05/12/2017

PER COURT :

1. None for the petitioner.
2. We have considered this petition paper book with the assistance of the learned AGP. We have gone through the pleadings of the petitioner set out in the memo of the petition.
3. There is no dispute that the petitioner is a 'grand daughter in law' of the original project affected person, as is stated in para no.6 of the memo of the petition. There is also no dispute that the petitioner will have to base her claim for acquiring the PAP certificate only after fulfilling the averments and the eligibility criteria prescribed by the State Government.
4. We have perused the Government Resolution dated 15/05/1995 issued through the Revenue and Forest Department wherein the grand

child and the daughter in law of the original PAP certificate holder have been included in the list of persons who will be entitled for seeking employment on the basis of the PAP certificate. The grand daughter in law, who in Marathi is referred to as “नातसुन”, has not been included in the said Government Resolution, which is in Marathi.

5. We have also considered the Government Resolution dated 25/05/1996 as well as, the decision of the State Government dated 30/10/2001 wherein a daughter in law or a grand son or a grand daughter who is an unmarried child of the son of the original PAP certificate holder, have also been covered in the eligibility criteria. A grand daughter in law has not been included, till date, according to the information supplied by the learned AGP. Learned AGP submits that he is making the above statements on the basis of the affidavit in reply dated 07/01/2016 filed by the District Rehabilitation Officer from the Office of the District Collector, Ahmednagar.

6. We, therefore, find no merit in the petition and the same is, therefore, dismissed. Needless to state, if the petitioner is entitled to any such benefit under any other existing policy of the Government, the disposal of this petition shall not be an impediment.

(SUNIL K. KOTWAL, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)