

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

924 WRIT PETITION NO.7146 OF 2018

SUREKHA RAMBHAU KHEDKAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Jadhav N.L.
AGP for Respondents/State : Mrs. G.L. Deshpande
Advocate for Respondents : Mr. K.B. Jadhavar for R/3 & 4.

...

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE &
MANGESH S. PATIL, JJ.**

DATE : 11.12.2018

PC. :-

Mr. Jadhav, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner orally pray for an amendment. It is submitted that inadvertently in prayer clause 'c' reference is made to year 2010 instead of year 2000. This being a typographical error the counsel submits that the petitioner be permitted to correct the typographical error by substituting the year 2000 instead of year 2010. Oral prayer is allowed.

2. The petitioner is before this Court with a prayer that the respondent no.3-Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Beed and respondent no.4-Education Officer (Primary), Zilla Parishad, Beed be directed to pay consequential monetary benefits in respect of the earlier service of petitioner

w.e.f. 19.10.2000 to 17.02.2004 inclusive of the other monetary benefits such as increments etc. considering her representation .

3. A notice was issued by this Court. The learned counsel appearing for respondent nos.3 and 4 i.e. the Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad and Education Officer (Primary) by inviting our attention to the documents placed on record submitted that the representation is submitted on 27.11.2017 to the Chief Executive Officer and there is also an endorsement of receipt of the representation on 27.11.2017. The learned counsel appearing for respondent nos.3 and 4 submitted that the Chief Executive Officer will decide the representation on the merits of the representation expeditiously.

4. In our opinion, by accepting this statement the petition itself can be disposed of. Accordingly, the respondent no.3-Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Beed is directed to decide the representation dated 27.11.2017 as expeditiously as possible and not later than ten weeks from the date of order of this Court. Needless to state that the respondent no.3 to decide the representation on the merits of the representation and if the petitioner pray for hearing the respondent no.3 may consider the request of grant of personal hearing to the petitioner. With these directions, the writ petition is disposed of.

[MANGESH S. PATIL, J.]

[PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.]