

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

CIVIL APPLICATION NO.58 OF 2018
 IN
 REVIEW PETITION (ST) NO.31287 OF 2017
 IN
 WRIT PETITION NO.4578 OF 2003

...
 Ms.Ujwala Ramdas Ahire ...Applicant
 v/s
 Bhairavanath Shikshan Sanstha & ors. ...Respondents
 ...
 Mr.Sanjay Kulkarni for the Applicant.
 Mr.Sanjiv A. Sawant for the Respondents.

...
CORAM : A.A. SAYED,J.

DATED : 2 APRIL 2018

(In Chamber at 2.45 pm.)

P.C.:

This Civil Application is taken out for condonation of 43 days delay in filing the Review Petition.

2. For the reasons stated in the Civil Application, the same is allowed in terms of prayer clause (a).
3. The Civil Application stands disposed of.

(A.A.SAYED, J.)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

REVIEW PETITION (ST) NO.31287 OF 2017
 IN
 WRIT PETITION NO.4578 OF 2003

...
 Ms.Ujwala Ramdas Ahire ...Applicant
 v/s
 Bhairavanath Shikshan Sanstha & ors. ...Respondents
 ...
 Mr.Sanjay Kulkarni for the Review Petitioner.
 Mr.Sanjiv A. Sawant for the Respondents.
 ...

CORAM : A.A. SAYED,J.

DATED : 2 APRIL 2018

(In Chamber at 2.45 pm.)

P.C.:

This Review Petition is filed seeking review of the order dated 27 April 2017 to the extent of refusal of backwages to the Review Petitioner. The reasons for not granting backwages to the Review Petitioner are recorded in paragraph 11 of the impugned order dated 27 April 2017. The impugned order also records the statement made by the learned Counsel for the Review Petitioner/Original Respondent No.1, on instructions, that the Respondent No.1 is not pressing for backwages, if she is granted continuity of service and consequential benefits.

2. Today, the learned Counsel who had appeared at the time of passing of the impugned order dated 27 April 2017 is not before the Court and there is a change of Advocate. Mr.Sawant, learned Counsel for the Respondents has filed Reply to the Review Petition. He relied upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of **Tamilnadu Electricity Board and anr. v/s. N.Raju Reddiar and anr.**, (1997) 9 Supreme Court Cases 736 wherein the practice of filing Review Petition after change of Advocate has been deprecated.

3. In the facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find any error apparent on the face of record in the impugned order dated 27 April 2017. Even otherwise, no case for review is made out. The Review Petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

(A.A.SAYED, J.)