

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

BENCH AT AURANGABAD.

WRIT PETITION NO.14541 OF 2017

Rutuja Satish Salve ... Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
and others. ... Respondents.

...

Mr.A.K.Gawali, advocate for the petitioner.
Mr.K.N.Lokhande, A.G.P. for the State.
Mr.S.A.Adhav, advocate for Respondent No.5
absent.

...

**CORAM : S.V.GANGAPURWALA AND
A.M. DHAVAL, JJ.**

Date : 19.03.2018.

PER COURT :

1. We have heard Mr. Gawali, the learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Patil, the learned Additional Government Pleader for the Respondent No. 1. The learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Additional Govt. Pleader submit that, the present petitioner is similarly situated

as that of petitioners in Writ Petition No. 9393 of 2014 and is praying for same relief. The matter is between the same institution.

2. The respondent Nos. 2 to 5 are served, however, when the matter is called out none appears for respondent Nos. 2 to 5.

3. In the light of the above and for the reasons recorded in Writ Petition No. 9393 of 2014 vide judgment and order dated 22.06.2015, we pass the same order as passed in Writ Petition No. 9393 of 2014.

O R D E R

I. The approval order dated 31.03.2008 (page 46) to the extent of granting approval from 15.06.2007 is set aside. Instead, the respondent authority is directed to grant approval to the appointment of the petitioner from 30.11.2004. The period of service of the petitioner shall be considered for all future increments, monetary benefits, etc. from the date of his appointment as mentioned above. However, the petitioner, in case, is not paid salary upto 15.06.2007, shall not be entitled for the same.

II. The writ petition is partly allowed in

above terms. No costs.

(A.M.DHAVAL, J.)

(S.V.GANGAPURWALA, J.)

asp/office/wp14541.17

