

(1)

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

WRIT PETITION NO.9655 OF 2017

Shaikh Faruq Shaikh Hussain,
Age: 35 years, Occ: Labour,
House No.14, Inayat Nagar,
Behind D.E. College, Pedgaon Road,
Parbhani.

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra
Through the Secretary,
Mantralaya, Mumbai.

2. The Chief Executive Officer,
Zilla Parishad, Nanded.

..RESPONDENTS

Mr Mahesh K. Bhosle, Advocate for petitioner;
Mrs M.A. Deshpande, A.G.P. for respondent/State

**CORAM : SHANTANU S. KEMKAR &
NITIN W. SAMBRE, JJ.**

DATE : 1st SEPTEMBER, 2017

ORAL ORDER :

The petitioner claims that in pursuance to the advertisement issued on 16th June, 2009 he had applied for the post of Attendant with respondent No.2 under category of Physically Handicapped (visually impaired).

(2)

2. According to the petitioner, though one Hemantkumar Shankarrao Wagare was appointed under the said category of SC/visually impaired, whereas he had applied under General category. The appointment order of the said Hemantkumar Shankarrao Wagare dated 24th November, 2009 is placed at Exhibit-F indicating therein that the appointment order was under the category S.C./Visually Impaired.

3. We find that challenging the said appointment order dated 24th November, 2009, the petitioner has filed this petition on 4th May, 2017 without impleading the said person viz., Hemantkumar Shankarrao Wagare. In the circumstances, at this belated stage i.e. after about more than seven years, we are not inclined to entertain the petition.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was making repeated representations before the competent authority for

(3)

redressal of his grievance and as such, there was delay in filing the petition.

5. The Supreme Court in the case of ***C. Jacob vs Director of Geology and Mining and another***, reported in ***(2008) 10 SCC 115***, in case of ***S.S. Rathore vs State of Madhya Pradesh*** reported in ***(1989) 4 SCC 582*** and ***State of Tripura and others vs Arabinda Chakraborty and others*** reported in ***(2014) 6 SCC 460*** has held that filing of repeated representations will not extend the period of limitation.

6. In the circumstances, on the ground of delay and latches, we decline to entertain this petition.

7. As a result, the petition fails and dismissed accordingly.

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)

(SHANTANU S. KEMKAR, J.)