

drp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.3128 OF 2019

Ravindra Jivaram Tayade PETITIONER
 VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and Others RESPONDENTS

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.3328 OF 2019

Narsing Gulab Rathod PETITIONER
 VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and Others RESPONDENTS

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.3329 OF 2019

Narendra Keshav Choudhari PETITIONER
 VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and Others RESPONDENTS

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.3330 OF 2019

Mehmuda Lalkha Tadvī PETITIONER
 VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and Others RESPONDENTS

.....

Mr. Sandeep B. Sontakke, Advocate for the petitioners
 Mr. Y. G. Gujrathi, AGP for respondent - State
 Mr. Maheshkumar S. Sonawane, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

.....

[CORAM : SUNIL P. DESHMUKH, J.]

DATE : 6th MARCH, 2019

ORDER :

1. This is a group of four petitions questioning propriety, legality and validity of orders passed by respondent No. 3 disposing of the appeals filed by the petitioners without interfering with order passed by respondent No.2, consequently affecting the petitioners adversely economically since that results into withholding of one increment with permanent future effect.

2. Heard learned advocates for the parties.

3. It emerges that in similar set of facts, this court had dealt with writ petition No. 7871 of 2017 and a group of 184 petitions, which were decided on 26th July, 2018. There is no serious dispute in respect of that present group of writ petitions is also identically situated and the circumstances have apparently been dealt with in paragraphs No. 15 and 16 of order dated 26th July, 2018 in writ petition No. 7817 of 2017 and group of writ petitions. As in those petitions, present petitioners agree to suffer punishment of stoppage of increment for one year simplicitor.

4. Having regard to aforesaid, it would be expedient that present group of writ petitions also is given similar treatment. Though learned advocate for respondent No. 2 purports to resist

the request, however, he is not able to come out of the factual situation stated herein above and that the order had been passed by this court in similar circumstances.

5. In view of aforesaid, writ petitions are partly allowed. Impugned orders passed by respondents No.2 and 3 are converted into orders of punishment in the nature of stoppage of one increment for one year simplicitor. Writ petitions, accordingly, stand disposed of.

**[SUNIL P. DESHMUKH]
JUDGE**