

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 4018 OF 2019

Vijay Ganpatrao Rohamare .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others .. Respondents

Ms. P. S. Talekar, Advocate i/by Talekar and Associate and Shri C. T. Jadhav, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mrs. R. P. Gaur, A.G.P. for the Respondent No. 1.

Shri Mahesh P. Kale, Advocate h/f Shri Nitin R. Bhavar, Advocate for the Respondent No. 3.

Shri Avinash S. Khedkar, Advocate for the Respondent No. 4.

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

DATE : 11TH MARCH, 2020.

FINAL ORDER :

. We cannot consider prayer clause C in view of the orders passed in writ petition filed by the petitioner earlier. The review filed by the petitioner is also dismissed.

2. We have heard Miss Talekar, the learned advocate for the petitioner, Mr. Khedkar and Mr. Kale, the learned counsel for respondents.

3. The learned advocate for the petitioner submits that, the petitioner would restrict the present writ petition to the extent of the order impugned in the prayer clause "A".

4. The order dated 19.12.2018 gives the supervision charge to the respondent No. 4 of the four departments.

5. Miss Talekar, the learned counsel submits that, though the respondent No. 4 is given additional charge to supervise the work of the four departments, he is acting as an additional administrative Officer.

6. Mr. Kale, the learned advocate holding for Mr. N. R. Bhavar, advocate for the respondent No. 3/Sansthan submits that, the respondent No. 4 is not appointed as an additional Administrative Officer, but is only given additional charge of supervision.

7. In the light of the statement made by the learned advocate for the Sansthan, it is not necessary to go into the debate of promotion. The designation of the petitioner and the respondent No. 4 appears to be a Deputy Executive Engineer.

8. As only additional charge is given to supervise the work, we need not entertain the petition as far as said order is concerned and the clarification is given that the respondent No. 4 is not an additional Administrative Officer.

9. The another contention of the petitioner is that, the respondent No.4 is writing confidential reports of the petitioner, but the confidential reports may be written by the administrative officer. The confidential reports cannot be written by the person

holding co-ordinate post.

10. Mr. Kale, the learned advocate for the respondent No. 3/sansthan submits that, the administrative officer would write the confidential reports of the petitioner.

11. As far as prayer clause “B” is concerned, the respondent Nos. 2 and 3 may take decision upon the representation of the petitioner on its own merits, in accordance with law, expeditiously and preferably within a period of three (03) months from today.

12. In the light of the above, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

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

bsb/March 20