

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**O.O.C.J.****WRIT PETITION NO. 2744 OF 2006****ALONGWITH****NOTICE OF MOTION NO.541 OF 2008****AND****NOTICE OF MOTION NO.40 OF 2010**

...

P.L.Chavan and Ors.

....Petitioners

V/S

The Mumbai Corporation of Gr.Mumbai
and Ors.

....Respondents

...

Mr.S.N.Pillai for the Petitioners.

Ms.Yamuna Parekh for the BMC.

Ms.Anjali Purav for the Respondents Nos. 4 to 6, 8,10 and 11.

...

CORAM : A.A. SAYED &**M.S.KARNIK,JJ.****DATED : 27 JULY 2017****P.C.:**

Learned Counsel for the Petitioners states that he has no instructions in the matter. He seeks an adjournment.

2. The Petition is of the year 2006. We have accommodated the learned Counsel time and again and made it known to him that no further time will be granted. It is not possible to accede to the request of the learned Counsel any more.

3. Even otherwise it is seen that grievance of the Petitioners (who have since retired) who belong to backward class, is that they have been denied promotions; however the persons who are likely to be affected have not been impleaded as parties to the Petition. In the case of **Vijay Kumar Kaul and ors. v/s. Union of India and ors.** (2012) 7 SCC 610, it has been held by the Supreme Court that in matters of promotion no reliefs can be granted in the absence of necessary parties who are likely to be affected by any order passed by the Court.

4. Hence, the Petition is dismissed. Rule to stand discharged.

5. In view of the disposal of the Petition, Notices of Motion do not survive and shall stand disposed of accordingly.

(M.S.KARNIK, J.)

(A.A.SAYED, J.)