

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 6202 of 2016

Kailas Datatraya Hake

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

.... Respondents

.....

Shri. Santosh G. Chapalgaonkar, Advocate for the petitioner
Smt. A. V. Gondhalekar, AGP for respondent/State
Shri. B. R. Sontakke Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 3

.....

AND

WRIT PETITION NO. 6206 of 2016

Swaminath S/o. Shivaji Dhaware

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

.... Respondents

.....

Shri. Santosh G. Chapalgaonkar, Advocate for the petitioner
Smt. A. V. Gondhalekar, AGP for respondent/State
Shri. R. V. Naiknavare, Advocate for respondent No. 2

.....

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

DATE : 12TH FEBRUARY, 2019

ORAL ORDER:

. The petitioner's claim appointment on compassionate ground.

2. Shri. Santosh Chapalgaonkar, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, the father of the petitioner in both these matters were working as Nakedar and Watchman, respectively. They died in the year 2002. The petitioners filed applications seeking appointment on compassionate ground. The applications are rejected. According to the learned counsel, for appointment on compassionate ground, the respondents ought not to have rejected the application on the count of administrative expenses having increased beyond 55%. The scheme of compassionate appointment is applicable to the petitioners. The applications of the petitioners have been erroneously rejected.

3. According to the learned counsel for the respondents, the claims of the petitioners are rejected in the year 2003. Again they were considered and were rejected in the year 2005. The petitioners were intimated to that effect. The petitioners have approached this Court after long time.

4. We have considered the submissions. There is nothing on record to show that the deceased-father of the petitioners were brought on CRT and were given benefit of Kalelkar Award. It would

not be possible to consider the case of the petitioners in absence of the said facts. Moreover, the claims of the petitioners were already rejected in the year 2003. The petitioners approached this Court very late. The grounds mentioned for rejection appear to be proper and reasonable. In view of that, the grievance of the petitioners cannot be considered.

5. The writ petitions are dismissed. No costs.

[A. M. DHAVALA]
JUDGE

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA]
JUDGE

Punde