

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 8448 OF 2018

Umesh Chandrakant Korde.

Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & another.

Respondents.

Mr. P.V. Barde, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. K.N. Lokhande, A.G.P. for the State.

Mr. Vinayak Upadhye, Advocate for respondent No.3.

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

Dated : **25th July, 2018.**

PER COURT :-

. The petitioner challenges second show-cause notice issued by the Disciplinary Authority as to why the punishment of termination should not be issued.

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the report of District Women and Child Development Officer, so also the District Child Protection Officer does not indict the present petitioner. The report is self explanatory about two groups. Learned Counsel

submits that the remand home is not an industry. The petitioner would not have any other remedy. Out of 10 charges, the petitioner is exonerated in 8 ½ charges. Without considering all these aspects, the second show-cause notice is issued.

3. We have heard Mr. Upadhye, the learned Counsel and the learned Additional Government Pleader

4. It would not be appropriate on our part to preempt any decision. The petitioner has an opportunity to file reply to the impugned show-cause notice. It is also imperative on the Disciplinary Authority to consider the reply filed by the petitioner alongwith all the other evidence and attending circumstances while taking the final decision.

5. As only the show-cause notice is challenged, we are not inclined to exercise our jurisdiction.

6. All merits of contentions of the parties are kept open.

7. With these observations, the Writ Petition is disposed of.

No costs.

(SUNIL K. KOTWAL)
JUDGE

(S.V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE