

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD
101 WRIT PETITION NO.233 OF 2018**

BEBIBAI KAUTIK PATIL

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS ..RESPONDENTS

...

Mr. V. S. Panpatte, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. S. B. Narwade, AGP for Respondents-State.

...

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
ANIL S. KILOR, JJ.**

DATED : 09th SEPTEMBER, 2019.

PER COURT:-

1. One of the ground for rejection of the proposal seeking approval to the appointment of the petitioner is that at the relevant time the petitioner was over aged.

2. The learned counsel submits that the management has submitted the proposal to respondent no.2 for relaxation of age. The same is still pending. According to the learned counsel in the order rejecting the proposal for approval, the respondent no.2 has pointed out some deficiencies. The same are also complied by the management.

3. We have heard learned A.G.P..

4. In view of the fact that the proposal for relaxation of the age is pending with respondent no.2, we pass the following order:

ORDER

- (i) The respondent no.2 shall take decision on the proposal forwarded by the management seeking relaxation of the age of the petitioner preferably within a period of three months.
- (ii) In case, the Additional Commissioner takes decision in favour of the petitioner relaxing the age, then respondent no.2 shall thereafter decide the proposal seeking approval to the appointment of the petitioner on its own merits, in accordance with law, expeditiously and preferably within a period of three months.
5. Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

(ANIL S. KILOR)
JUDGE

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE