

(1)

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

WRIT PETITION NO.150 OF 2019

Damodhar Dashrathrao Shingare,
Age: 58 years, Occu: Pensioner,
R/o Kille Dharur, Tq. Kaij,
District Beed

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through Secretary,
Co-operation marketing & Textile
Department, Mantralaya,
Mumbai-32
 2. The Maharashtra State Agriculture
Marketing Board, Pune,
District Pune
Through its Managing Director
 3. The Director of Marketing,
Maharashtra State, Pune
 4. The Maharashtra State Bajar Samiti
Karmachari Seva Nivrutti Yojana,
Pune,
Through its Chief Executive Officer
Shri. Subjhashrao Ghule
- ..RESPONDENTS

Mr D. J. Choudhary, Advocate for petitioner;
Ms. R. P. Gour, A.G.P. for respondents/State

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE
AND
S.M.GAVHANE, JJ.**

DATE : 8th JANUARY, 2019

(2)

ORAL ORDER :

Heard Mr Choudhary, learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner.

2. Though the petitioner by way of basic prayer clause (C) prays for directions to respondent No.2 to approve Rules of Maharashtra Rajya Bajar Samiti Karmachari Seva Nivrutti Yojana, service rules of the employees and the election rules of the office bearers of respondent No.4 i.e. The Maharashtra State Bajar Samiti Karmachari Nivrutti Yojana, Pune, factual aspects emerges from perusal of the documents placed on record as well as the reference made to title clause of the petition that representation is already submitted to the Principal Secretary, Co-operation marketing & Textile Department i.e. respondent No.1 and the Managing Director, Maharashtra State Agriculture Marketing Board, Pune i.e. respondent No.2.

3. Perusal of this representation shows that the petitioner had already approached this Court by

(3)

filing writ petition No.10016 of 2015. The order passed by this Court dated 22nd February, 2016 which is placed on record shows that time was sought for at the instance of learned A.G.P. as the instructions were awaited. Subsequently, it seems that the Hon'ble Minister was requested to take a decision and as there was positive response from Hon'ble Minister, the petitioner thought it fit to withdraw the petition by pursuing his request before Hon'ble Minister.

4. This fact refers to in the representation and more particularly at clause-8 of the representation. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that though the Hon'ble Minister was time and again requested but due to paucity of time, Hon'ble Minister was unable to take any decision, as such, the petitioner left with no choice but to approach the Principal Secretary as well as Managing Director of the Board by submitting representation. In the representation, the petitioner refers to various documents and list of

(4)

documents is as many as twenty documents.

5. Considering these facts, we are of the opinion that the petition itself can be disposed of by directing respondent Nos.1 and 2 to decide the representation dated 27th November, 2018 as expeditiously as possible and not later than twelve (12) weeks from the date of this order, needless to state on merits of the representation and if the authorities are of the opinion that the opportunity of hearing to be granted to the petitioner, such an opportunity of hearing be granted to him, calling upon him by way of notice.

6. With this direction, the petition is disposed of.

(**S.M.GAVHANE**)
JUDGE

(**PRASANNA B. VARALE**)
JUDGE

Tupe