

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 5858 OF 2017

Ravindra Pralhadrao Goswami .. Petitioner

Versus

The Chairman Life Insurance
Corporation of India, Mumbai and others.. Respondents

Shri Tukaram M. Venjane, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Shri A. O. Kasliwal, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 1 to 4

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
SUNIL K. KOTWAL, JJ.**

DATE : 16TH JULY, 2018.

FINAL ORDER :

. Mr. Venjane, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, the petitioner is entitled for continuation for his service as Financial Services Executive till the scheme is in vogue. Similar orders are passed by different High Courts and those are placed on record. The learned counsel further submits that, the said scheme pursuant to which the petitioner was appointed is still in force.

2. Mr. Kasliwal, the learned counsel for respondents submits that, similar issue was before the Apex Court and the Apex Court has dismissed the writ petition and special leave petitions filed

observing that while making the last extension it was made clear that, no further extension would be granted. The learned counsel submits that, the petitioner has refused the option granted to him for switching over.

3. The Apex Court has passed the following order :

"Heard learned counsel for the parties at length.

On perusal of the impugned order we find that the High Court has rightly appreciated the factual and legal position in the matter, particularly considering the terms and conditions of the contract. While making the last extension it was made clear that no further extension would be granted. More so, in view of the option granted for switching over and also the new policy/scheme, we find no ground to interfere in the matter. The writ petition as well as special leave petitions being bereft of merit deserve dismissal and are hereby dismissed."

4. It is not disputed that, the petitioner was appointed pursuant to the policy for the 08th year and it was specifically stated in the last order of extension that it is last and final extension of contractual period to the FSEs and there will be no further extension after completion of the 8th year. The Apex Court has upheld the same. It is further submitted that, the

petitioner has also not accepted the option.

5. In the light of the above, no case for interference is made out. The writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

[SUNIL K. KOTWAL, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

bsb/July 18