

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 9204 OF 2014

Gajbhar C. Revansidha.

..Petitioner.

Versus

State of Maharashtra & Others.

..Respondents.

Mr. C. R. Sadasivan i/b Mr. N. M. Ganguli for the Petitioner.

Mr. V. M. Mali, AGP for the Respondent-State.

Coram : Ranjit More &
Smt. S. S. Jadhav, JJ.

Date : **March 16, 2018.**

P. C. :

1. Heard. By this petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the Petitioner is challenging the orders dated 5th March 2013 and 14th April 2013 passed by the Regional Joint Director and the Director of Education (Higher Education), Maharashtra State, Pune respectively whereunder the Petitioner is denied extension in the age of retirement from 60 to 62 years.

2. Admittedly, the Petitioner was working as an Assistant Professor in social science subject with Respondent Nos.5 and 6 and he attained the age of superannuation on 30th September 2012. The Petitioner claims that he is entitled for extension of two years service.

3. The extension in the service is denied to the Petitioner on the ground that there is no workload in the social science subject, which the Petitioner was teaching. The Petitioner was working in the said college with Respondent Nos.5 and 6 under the orders of this Court dated 3rd December 2012, thought there was no workload. We,

therefore, cannot find fault with the impugned order.

4. Be that as it may, in the year 2013 the Petitioner has attained the age of 62 years. This Court, in the year 2018, cannot grant extension in the age of retirement. The Petitioner has prayed for the payment of salary for the period for which his services were not extended. We find that the Petitioner has not worked and therefore, refusal order is correct. The petition is devoid of any merit and the same is, therefore, dismissed.

[Smt. S. S. JADHAV, J.]

[RANJIT MORE, J.]