

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

964 CIVIL APPLICATION NO.8930 OF 2021
IN
REVIEW APPLICATION (ST) NO.7512 OF 2021
WITH
REVIEW APPLICATION (ST) NO.7512 OF 2021

The Chief Executive Officer & another .. Applicants
Versus
Vikram Manohar Wadmare and another .. Respondents

...

In both the matters :

Mr V.V. Bhavthankar, Advocate for the Applicants
Mr M.P. Tripathi, Advocate for Respondent No.1
Mr S.P. Tiwari, AGP for the Respondent – State

...

CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA
AND
R.N. LADDHA, JJ.

DATE : 01-09-2021

PER COURT : -

1. The Civil Application bearing No.8930 of 2021 is filed seeking condonation of delay of 746 days in filing review. The Review Application bearing (St) No.7512 of 2021 is filed with regard to the order dated 08-01-2019 passed by this Court allowing the writ petition setting aside the order of the Zilla Parishad rejecting the application of the original writ petitioner seeking appointment on compassionate ground. The application of the writ petitioner was rejected by the Zilla Parishad on the ground that the post occupied by

his father was not funded by the government and was self-funded by the Zilla Parishad. This Court under order dated 08-01-2019 in Writ Petition No.1441 of 2018 relied upon the earlier judgment and orders passed by this Court in case of similarly situated employees. The orders passed in Writ Petition No.461 of 2012 dated 12-12-2012, Writ Petition No.5801 of 2012 dated 02-07-2013 and Writ Petition No.10296 of 2015 dated 18-04-2016 were relied while passing the order under review. In Writ Petition No.461 of 2012 under order dated 12-12-2012 this Court specifically came to the conclusion that the scheme of compassionate appointment is equally applicable to Zilla Parishad and the stand taken by the Zilla Parishad that as the post occupied by the father of the writ petitioner was funded by the Zilla Parishad, the compassionate appointment cannot be given, is erroneous. Earlier illustrations were also considered by the Court.

2. While delivering the Judgment under review, we have considered the aforesaid judgments.

3. In view of that, the present applications for condonation of delay and review stand rejected. No costs.

[R.N. LADDHA]
JUDGE

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA]
JUDGE