

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD
CONTEMPT PETITION NO.718 OF 2017 IN
WRIT PETITION NO.10753 OF 2016

Prof. Dr. Shubhangi Dinesh Rath

Petitioner

Versus

Dr.Dhanraj Mane & others

Respondents

Mr.S.V.Deshmukh, advocate for the petitioner.

Mr.Y.B.Bolkar, advocate holding for Mr.A.B.Girase, advocate for Respondent No.3.

Mr.Nilesh N. Desale, advocate for Respondent No.4.

CORAM : R.M.BORDE AND

K.K.SONAWANE, JJ.

DATE : 28th February, 2018.

P.C. :

1 The petitioner is alleging violation of the directions issued by this Court on 26th April, 2017. In the said order, statement made by Mr.Tekale, learned Counsel appearing for Respondent No.5 i.e. Principal of the College was recorded that the process of promotion would be completed within a period of three months. The statement was accepted by this Court. It was also informed that Respondent No.5 would issue duplicate service book to the petitioner.

2 The petitioner alleges breach of the undertaking given by Respondent No.5 to this Court.

3 An affidavit-in-reply has been presented by Smt.Mangala A. Sabadra, Principal, Smt. Padambai Kapurchand Kotecha Mahila Mahavidyalaya, Shantinagar, Bhusawal, District

Jalgaon,. In the affidavit, it is recorded that duplicate service book has been supplied to the petitioner on 15.05.2017 and the same has been duly received by the contempt petitioner. So far as process of promotion is concerned, it is recorded that the University has constituted a Selection Committee, which was again reconstituted at some point of time. The petitioner appeared before the Selection Committee for the purposes of examining his performance by the members of the Committee for consideration of his claim for promotion. The Selection Committee has submitted its report to the University. The petitioner was directed to submit the API (Academic Performance Indicator), in view of the amendment by University Grants Commission. The API (Academic Performance Indicator) of the petitioner has been submitted and appropriate decision has to be taken by the Respondents.

4 Since, necessary steps have been taken as undertaken by Respondent-College, grievance raised by the petitioner, in the instant contempt petition, does not deserve consideration. We expect the University to take appropriate decision on the proposal tendered by the Selection Committee in pursuance to the API of the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within three months from today. Since grievance raised by the petitioner has been substantially complied with, Contempt Petition does not deserve to be considered and same is disposed of. Notices issued earlier stands discharged.

K.K.SONAWANE
JUDGE

R.M.BORDE
JUDGE

adb/