

hvn

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION****WRIT PETITION NO. 8044 OF 2015**

Namdeo Vitthal Adhatrao

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors.

... Respondents

Mr. R.K. Mendadkar for the petitioner.

Mr. S.B. Kalel, AGP for the respondent State.

CORAM : SHANTANU KEMKAR &**M.S. SONAK, JJ.****DATED : JUNE 07, 2017.****P.C.**

Petitioner was working on the post of helper with respondent no. 3 Maharashtra State Road Transport Corporation. His appointment was made treating him to be belonging to Scheduled Tribe. However, the Caste Scrutiny Committee rejected his caste claim and held him not to be belonging to Scheduled Tribe. In the circumstances, respondent no.2 employer passed the impugned order of termination of services of the petitioner on 14.6.2000 Exhibit. C. Petitioner submitted representation against the said termination order on 1.10.2001 Exhibit. E before respondent no.2 and 3. Thereafter petitioner did not take any steps and filed this

petition on 6.7.2015 i.e. after about 15 years from the date of termination of his services.

2. In view of the aforesaid, we find that the petition suffers from the delay and laches. In the petition also no explanation whatsoever has been offered by the petitioner explaining the delay. In the circumstances, on the ground of delay and laches in approaching this Court by way of the petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, we decline interference in the order of the year 2000. In the result the petition is dismissed.

(M.S. SONAK, J.)

(SHANTANU KEMKAR, J.)