

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 7126 OF 2014

**SHINDUTAI BANSI HAWALE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS**

Mr.A.B.Hawale, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr.V.S.Badakh, AGP for respondent/State.
Mr.N.L.Jadhav, Advocate for respondent No.5.

**CORAM : S.V.GANGAPURWALA &
S.M.GAVHANE, JJ.
DATED : 26.09.2018**

P.C. :-

1. Mr. Hawale, learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was engaged in the work of digging well as per the order of the respondents. The petitioner has worked, however, payment is not made. The petitioner approached respondent No.3—Grievance Redressal Officer, Beed. The report is submitted by respondent No.3 to the effect that the petitioner had carried out work.

2. Mr.Jadhav, learned Counsel submits that in-fact on-line record was with one Smt.J.N. Chavan. Said person did not submit the record. In view of that same could not be verified. Direct payment cannot be made by respondent No.5.

3. Affidavit is filed by the Chief Executive Officer, which states that the procedure to disburse the amount in MREGS Scheme of the petitioner is required to be followed as per the provisions under the MREGS Act and Rules.

4. It appears that the respondents have not seriously disputed that the petitioner has carried out digging work. In the light of above, as per the procedure under the provisions of the MREGS Act and Rules, payment shall be made to the petitioner by the respondents preferably within a period four months. If the payment is not made within four months, then respondent No.4 shall pay interest at the rate of 6% p.a.

5. The writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

[S . M . GAVHANE , J .]

[S . V . GANGAPURWALA , J .]