

jsn

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

**REVIEW PETITION NO.54 OF 2014
IN
WRIT PETITION NO.710 OF 1992**

Dr. (Mrs.) Vidya Vijay Naik ... Petitioner
V/s.
The Principal, Chembur Comprehensive ... Respondents
College of Education & Ors.

Manjiri Parasnis with Tejas P. Kasar, i/b. SRM Law Associates for
the Petitioner.
Mr. Kedar Dighe, AGP for the State.

**CORAM: A.A.SAYED &
R. I. CHAGLA, JJ.**
DATE: 18TH MARCH, 2019.

PC:-

1. It is an admitted position that the letter dated 3rd May, 1978 was not placed before the Division Bench which had passed the order under review as far back as on 26th March, 2002. In paragraph 6 of the order under review it has been recorded as follows :-

6. As observed above, the Petitioner had obtained at the time of her appointment in 1975 a B.Sc. Degree and an M.Ed. Degree. However, candidates eligible to be appointed as Lecturers were, in addition thereto, required to have three years Post B.Ed. Teaching experience in a Secondary School. Admittedly, at the time of her appointment, the Petitioner did not have this teaching experience.

2. The Court went to direct that the Petitioner be placed under the pay scale for lecturers w.e.f. 13th July, 1978. Learned Counsel for the Review Petitioner contends that the service of the Petitioner ought to have been considered from 29th July, 1975. Learned AGP has pointed out that the said letter dated 3rd May, 1978 which is now produced is not verified by the Education Department and that after all these years it is not possible to verify the same. We find that it was conceded by the learned Counsel for the Petitioner before the Court that at the relevant time that the Petitioner did not have the teaching experience.

3. We do not find any error apparent in the order under review. Even otherwise no case for review is made out.

4. The Review Petition is accordingly dismissed.

(R. I. CHAGLA, J.)

(A.A.SAYED, J.)