

(1)

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

14 WRIT PETITION NO.2023 OF 2020

**SUBHASH NAMDEO TANTAK AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS**

...

Mr A. B. Gaikwad (Patil), Advocate for petitioners;
Mr P. S. Patil, A.G.P. for respondent Nos.1 to 4;
Mr A. D. Aghav, Advocate for respondent No.5

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
AND
S. G. MEHARE, JJ.**

DATE : 20th September, 2021

PER COURT:

1. By this petition, the petitioners have put forth prayer clauses (22-B) and (22-C) as under :

“22 (B) By an appropriate Order or direction in the nature of Writ of Mandamus or any other Writ of the like nature, the Zilla Parishad, Ahmednagar may kindly be directed to grant the benefit of non-functional pay scale of Executive Engineer (Rs.15600-39100 Grade Pay Rs.6600) and arrears thereof to the Petitioners and for that matter issue necessary Orders;

22 (C) By an appropriate Writ or direction in the nature of Writ of Mandamus or any other writ of the like

(2)

nature, the impugned Clause B-3 of the Government Resolution dated 01.04.2010 issued by the Government of Maharashtra in Department of Finance may kindly be struck down as arbitrary, erroneous and unconstitutional and for that matter issue necessary Orders;”

2. We have perused the judgment delivered by this Court on 06/02/2019 in Writ Petition No.2605/2017 at the Principal Seat.

3. The learned Advocate representing respondent No.5 submits that the process for redressing the grievance of the petitioners has commenced and necessary steps would be taken to ensure that they are granted benefits as prayed for.

4. The learned Advocate for the petitioners places before us a copy of a Government Resolution dated 19/07/2019 introduced by the Finance Department of the State of Maharashtra, wherein specific directions have been given that the order of this Court dated 06/02/2019 (supra) should be complied with and the Government Resolution dated 13/06/2016 stands set aside. We have taken the said Government Resolution dated 19/07/2021 on record, marked as ‘X-1’ for identification.

5. The learned Advocate for respondent No.5 submits that this Court may direct a time frame, within which the reliefs can be granted to the petitioners.

6. In view of the above, this petition stands worked out and is, therefore, disposed off.

7. We expect respondent No.5 to ensure that these petitioners are granted the benefits as expeditiously as possible and preferably on or before 30/11/2021. We make it clear that no extension of time would be granted.

(S. G. MEHARE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

sjk