

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO. 1019 OF 2019

SHWETA PRABHU AND 24 ORS., ... Petitioners

Versus

THE DEAN, GOA MEDICAL COLLEGE AND
HOSPITAL AND 5 ORS., ... Respondents

Mr. Nigel Da Costa Frias and Mr. G. Malik, Advocates for the
Petitioners.

Mr. D.Pangam, Advocate General with Mr. Shivadatta Prakash
Munj, Additional Government Advocate for the Respondents.

Coram:- M. S. SONAK &
SMT. M. S. JAWALKAR, JJ.

Date:- 9th December, 2019

ORAL ORDER

Heard Mr. Costa Frias, the learned Counsel for the petitioners
and Mr. Pangam, learned Advocate General for the respondents.

2. The petitioners, who are the nurses since employed at the
Goa Medical College (Respondent no.1), seek the following two
reliefs :

(a) Parity in matters of pay and emoluments with the regular
employed nurses in terms of OM dated 24.06.2015 at exhibit J
collectively (page 66);

(b) Regularization of other nurses.

3. Insofar as the first relief is concerned, the learned Advocate General makes a statement that this petition itself can be considered as a representation to the respondent nos.1 and 2 and some decision will be taken on the same within two months from today. The learned Advocate General submits that this matter will have to be considered on case to case basis because it is reported that some of the petitioners have even left services. Reference is also necessary to dates of appointment and other service details. He further states that decision in accordance with law will be taken within two months from today in respect of all the petitioners.

4. Insofar as the second issue is concerned, the learned Advocate General states that it will not be possible for respondent nos.1 and 2 to consider the issue of regularization.

5. According to us, this petition can be disposed off requiring the respondent nos.1 and 2 to treat the present petition as a representation and to dispose off the same within two months from today so far as the first grievance is concerned.

6. In case the petitioners are aggrieved, liberty is granted to the petitioners to institute a fresh petition.

7. Similarly, insofar as the second grievance of the petitioners is concerned, for the present, we do not deem it appropriate to entertain the petition. However, we grant liberty to the petitioners to file a fresh petition in case they chose to do so by providing further details in regard to their claim for regularization at a later stage.

8. With the directions and liberty as aforesaid, we dispose off this petition.

SMT. M. S. JAWALKAR, J.

M. S. SONAK, J.

arp/*