

—
IN THE COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR
WRIT PETITION NO. 5242/2017

(Mahendra Amrutrao Balsaraf vs. State of Maharashtra and others)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
 Coram, appearances, Court's orders
 of directions and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's order

Mr. N.C.Phadnis, Advocate for the petitioner
 Mr. J.Y. Ghurde, Assistant Government Pleader for the respondent nos.1 and 3
 Mr. V.G.Palshikar, Advocate for respondent no.2

CORAM : SMT. VASANTI A. NAIK &
MRS. SWAPNA JOSHI, JJ.
DATED : 6th April, 2018.

Heard.

The only prayer made by the petitioner in the instant petition is for a direction against the respondent-Scrutiny Committee to decide the caste claim of the petitioner at the earliest, as the benefits of the Assured Progressive Scheme are not granted to the petitioner.

We are surprised that the respondent no.2 has stopped granting the benefits of the Assured Progressive Scheme to the petitioner though the petitioner was granted the said benefits for some time. Till the caste claim of the petitioner is pending and is not invalidated, the respondent no.2 should have paid the benefits of the Assured Progressive Scheme to the petitioner, more so when the benefits were already granted.

Mr. J.Y. Ghurde, the learned Assistant Government

Pleader appearing for the respondent-Scrutiny Committee states on instructions that the claim of the petitioner is pending before the Scrutiny Committee and the vigilance enquiry is on the verge of completion. It is stated that the caste claim of the petitioner could be decided within three months.

In view of the statement made by the learned Assistant Government Pleader, the grievance of the petitioner should stand redressed.

Hence, by accepting the statement made by the learned Assistant Government Pleader that would be binding on the Scrutiny Committee, we dispose of the Writ Petition, with no order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE