

drp

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.3968 OF 2019

Sadashiv Vinayak Rathod

PETITIONER

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and Others

RESPONDENTS

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.3969 OF 2019

Santosh Eknath Sawant

PETITIONER

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and Others

RESPONDENTS

.....

Mr. Babasaheb V. Dhage, Advocate for the petitioners
Mr. A. V. Deshmukh, AGP for respondent - State

.....

[CORAM : SUNIL P. DESHMUKH AND
R. G. AVACHAT, JJ.]

DATE : 16th SEPTEMBER, 2019

ORDER :

1. Heard learned advocates for the parties.
2. The writ petitions have been preferred aggrieved by decision dated 8th March, 2019 of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal, Aurangabad in Original Applications filed by the present petitioners bearing No. 227 of 2019 and 226 of 2019, whereunder the Tribunal had rejected request of the petitioners

to set aside suspension orders.

3. Learned AGP has tendered across photo copy of covering letter dated 13th September, 2019 with appendage of order dated 18th June, 2019, referring to revocation of suspension order dated 17th May, 2019.

4. In view of aforesaid, it is apparent that the writ petitions have been rendered only of academic interest.

5. Learned advocate Mr. Dhage, purports to argue that suspension had been arbitrary and capricious and further purports to draw our attention to that, revocation of the suspension of the petitioner has been subject to judicial decision and disciplinary action.

6. It would not be necessary for us to dwell on the submissions advanced by learned advocate for the petitioners, for, the suspension of the petitioners has been revoked and the petitioners have been allowed to resume duty and since writ petitions had been pending, reference appears to have been made to that separate orders would be passed regarding revocation of suspension and period of suspension in due course after decision of the court and final decision of the departmental

disciplinary action.

7. Having regard to that suspension of the petitioners has been revoked, very cause underlying the writ petitions gets subsided. In the circumstances, we do not consider writ petitions be proceeded further.

8. Writ petitions, having regard to aforesaid, are disposed of. In view of disposal of writ petitions, pending civil applications also stand disposed of.

9. Needless to refer to that, this order would not affect disciplinary proceedings as are available pursuant to rules, which are referred to in the revocation order.

[R. G. AVACHAT]
JUDGE

[SUNIL P. DESHMUKH]
JUDGE