

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

921 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 15653 OF 2016
IN WP/3842/2005

PRADIP GULABRAO PAWAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Shah Subodh P.
Addl. GP for Respondents State: Mrs. M. A. Deshpande
Advocate for the Respondents : Mr. Y. B. Bolkar and Mr.
L. S. Mahajan h/for Mr. R. B. Raghuvanshi

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
K. L. WADANE, JJ.**

DATE : 17th February, 2017

ORDER:

1. Heard Mr. Shah, learned counsel for the applicant, Learned AGP, Mr. Bolkar and Mr. Mahajan, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. The learned counsel for the respondents have opposed the application on the ground that past appointment orders could have been produced by the petitioner earlier. No reason is given for non production of the same. According to the learned counsel, earlier appointment orders are also not relevant.

3. The petitioner seeks to bring on record the documents to substantiate that during pendency of the

writ petition, the petitioner was in service so also copies of the ordinance and qualification that the petitioner had acquired during the pendency of the writ petition. Dispute in the writ petition pertains to the approval to the appointment as lecturer. It is also submitted that writ petition was earlier disposed of and review was filed. The documents sought to be produced were part of the review petition and as the review is allowed, the writ petition is restored to its original position.

4. Considering the aforesaid aspects of the matter, civil application is allowed in terms of prayer clause A. Necessary amendment shall be carried out within 14 days.

5. Needless to state that non applicants will have every right to agitate with regard to the amendment and additional documents by filing their affidavit.

6. Civil application disposed of. No costs.

(K. L. WADANE, J.)

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.)

JPC