

hvn

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 889 OF 2017

Kamadi Vijay Sakharam and anr. ... Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and anr. ... Respondents

Mr. Sagar A.Mane for the petitioner.

Ms.Niksha Mehra, AGP for the respondent State.

**CORAM : SHANTANU KEMKAR &
PRAKASH D. NAIK, JJ.
DATED : JANUARY 23, 2017.**

P.C.

Not on board. In view of the urgency, taken on production board.

2. Heard. The grievance of the Petitioner is that Respondent No. 2. has not considered the proposal sent by petitioner No. 2 for approval of Petitioner's appointment.

3. Keeping in view the aforesaid, we dispose of the petition by directing Respondent No.2 to consider and decide the said proposal Exhibit E to the petition as expeditiously as possible and preferably within four weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. The Petitioner to supply copy of entire proposal along with a copy of this order to Respondent no.2.

4. Till aforesaid proposal regarding Petitioner No.1's proposal is considered and decided, status quo as it exists today in respect of post occupied by the Petitioner No. 1, shall be maintained by the parties.

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

(PRAKASH D. NAIK, J.)

(SHANTANU KEMKAR, J.)