

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 1103 OF 2019

Shaikh Gani Ismile Saheb ...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

Dr Supriya L Pansambhal, Advocate for Petitioner
Mrs Geeta L. Deshpande, A. G.P. for Respondents-State
Mr P.R. Tandale, Advocate for Respondent No. 4
Mr J.M. Murkute, Advocate for Respondent No. 5

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1104 OF 2019

Gaikwad Keshav Sambhaji ...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

Dr Supriya L Pansambhal, Advocate for Petitioner
Mrs Geeta L. Deshpande, A. G.P. for Respondents-State

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1105 OF 2019

Chikale Ramrao Gangadhar ...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

Dr Supriya L Pansambhal, Advocate for Petitioner
Mrs Geeta L. Deshpande, A. G.P. for Respondents-State
Mr P.R. Tandale, Advocate for Respondent No. 4
Mr J.M. Murkute, Advocate for Respondent No. 5 and 6

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 1110 OF 2019

Barure Namdeo Vyankatrao ...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Ors. ...Respondents

Dr Supriya L Pansambhal, Advocate for Petitioner
Mrs Geeta L. Deshpande, A. G.P. for Respondents-State
Mr P.R. Tandale, Advocate for Respondent No. 4
Mr J.M. Murkute, Advocate for Respondent No. 5 and 6

**CORAM : S.V. GANGAPURWALA
AND
SHRIKANT D. KULKARNI, JJ.**

DATE : 30TH JANUARY, 2020

PER COURT :

1. The petitioners in all these writ petitions are employees of the Kailaswasi Bhujangrao Nivasi Mukbadhir Vidyalaya, Jalkot, Tal. Jalkot, Dist. Latur. The petitioners are seeking dual reliefs (i) to give copy of the service book duly updated and (ii) arrears of salary.
2. Mr Murkute, the learned Counsel for respondent Nos. 5 and 6, on instructions submits that the service book of the petitioners are updated and the same would be provided to the petitioners within a period of two weeks from today. The statement is accepted as an undertaking to the Court.
3. As far as arrears of salary is concerned, there are rival

claims. According to the petitioners, salary from the year 2009 is not paid. Whereas according to the institution, the petitioners were absent. Mr Tandale, the learned Counsel for respondent No. 4 submits that the inquiry was conducted and illegality was found in the functioning of the respondent Nos. 5 and 6. Recommendations were made to cancel the licence. The same is subsequently cancelled.

4. Be that as it may, the respondent No. 4 is the proper authority to consider the rival claims. Respondent Nos. 5 and 6 shall forward the salary bills of the petitioners for the period as claimed by the petitioners with its notings and endorsement about the petitioners having worked/not worked for the period in question. The respondent No. 4 shall process the said salary bills on its own merits. The salary bills shall be forwarded by the respondent Nos. 5 and 6 as observed above within a period of four weeks from today. The decision shall be taken by respondent No. 4, preferably within a period of six weeks thereafter. Depending upon the decision taken by respondent No. 4, further steps be taken.

5. Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of. No costs.

[SHRIKANT D. KULKARNI, J.] [S.V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]