

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

26 WRIT PETITION NO.4691 OF 2019
WITH CA/8396/2019 IN WP/4691/2019 WITH WP/4692/2019 WITH
WP/4693/2019 WITH WP/4694/2019 WITH WP/4695/2019 WITH
WP/4696/2019 WITH WP/4697/2019 WITH WP/4698/2019 WITH
WP/4699/2019 WITH WP/4700/2019 WITH WP/4701/2019 WITH
WP/4702/2019 WITH WP/4703/2019 WITH WP/4704/2019 WITH
WP/4705/2019 WITH WP/4706/2019 WITH WP/4707/2019 WITH
WP/4708/2019 WITH WP/4709/2019 WITH WP/4710/2019 WITH
WP/4711/2019

SANDEEP SHIVRAM CHAVAN
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND ANOTHER

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Vikrant S Valse with Mr. G.V. Wani
AGP for Respondents: Mrs. A.V. Gondhalekar, Additional G.P.
Mr. N.N. Patil, Advocate for respondent No.2.

...

CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
K.K. SONAWAJE, JJ.

DATE : 22ND AUGUST, 2019.

PER COURT:

The learned counsel for the respondent No.2 raises a preliminary objection that the petitioners in this writ petition are serving at Mumbai or at Nagpur. The salaries are paid to them at Mumbai or at Nagpur. Recoveries are also claimed at Mumbai or Nagpur. As such, this court may not entertain the instant writ petitions.

We have heard Mr. Wani, learned counsel for the petitioners.

It appears from the cause title so also from the facts on record that these petitioners are serving either at Mumbai or at Nagpur. The impugned orders are also passed at Mumbai. The recoveries also claimed

from their salary at Mumbai or Nagpur. In view of that, no part of cause of action arises within the territorial limits of the jurisdiction of this court.

Considering the aforesaid, writ petitions are returned back to the petitioners for presenting it before the appropriate Bench/Forum. Interim orders passed earlier to continue for a period of 15 days from today, so as to enable the petitioners to take appropriate steps.

[K.K. SONAWANE]
JUDGE

[S.V. GANGAPURWALA]
JUDGE

grt/-