

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

**CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 2955 OF 2019
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 4669 OF 2018**

Pappu Yadavrao Gaikwad
and others

.. Applicants

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others .. Respondents

Shri Bramhanand M. Dhanure, Advocate for Applicants.
Ms. Vaishali N. Jadhav Patil, A.G.P. for Respondent Nos. 1, 3 to 6.
Shri T. M. Venjane, Advocate h/f Shri S. P. Urgunde, Advocate for the Respondent No. 7.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
A. M. DHAVAL, JJ.**

DATE : 22ND FEBRUARY, 2019.

FINAL ORDER :

. Present applicants contend that, they have filed complaint against the non applicant No. 7, pursuant to which departmental enquiry is initiated against the non applicant No. 7. Present application is filed for intervention in the matter.

2. We have heard the learned counsel for applicants and the learned counsel for non applicants.

3. In service jurisprudence, there is nothing like public interest litigation. The departmental enquiry is initiated against the non applicant No. 7 by the employer. The matter would be between employer and employee. The applicants are not concerned with the employer. The applicants are strangers. In service matters such an application cannot be entertained. The civil application as such is rejected.

4. The learned counsel for applicants submitted that, though notices are not issued in the writ petition, still it is represented that stay has been granted in the writ petition. It is made clear that, there is no stay granted in the writ petition.

[A. M. DHAVALÉ, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

bsb/Feb. 19