

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE SIDE, BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

14 WRIT PETITION NO. 9987 OF 2017

SANDIP SURESH NIKAM
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. R.S. Pawar
AGP for Respondent/State : Mr. A.R. Kale

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

DATED : August 7, 2017.

PER COURT :

. Heard.

2. The grievance of the petitioner is that he is working on the post of Special Teacher since 2009, but he has not been extended the benefits of the Government Resolution dated 31st August 2009.

3. The learned AGP submits that before approaching the Court, the petitioner has not submitted the representation before the competent authority.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has already submitted a representation before the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 for extending the benefits of the aforesaid Government Resolution, but still the decision is not

taken by the competent authority of the respondents.

5. Keeping in view of the fact that the claim of the petitioner has not been decided, we are inclined to dispose of the petition by granting liberty to the petitioner to submit a detail representation with supporting documents before the respondents within one month from today. On receipt of representation of the petitioner, the competent authority of the respondents shall examine the same and take appropriate decision on it in accordance with law within three months from the date of such representation.

6. While considering the claim of the petitioner, the competent authority of the respondents shall also take in to consideration that respondent No. 2 has already recommended the claim of the petitioner for grant of benefit of the said Government Resolution.

7. With the aforesaid directions, the petition is disposed of.

[N.W. SAMBRE, J.]

[SHANTANU S. KEMKAR, J.]

ssc/