

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO.2156 OF 2021

The Gondia District Central Cooperative Bank Ltd., through its Chief Executive Officer, Gondia, Tahsil and District Gondia.

... Petitioner

- Versus -

- 1) State of Maharashtra, through its Secretary, Ministry of Cooperative Department, Mantralaya, Fort, Mumbai.
- 2) The Commissioner of Cooperation, State of Maharashtra, Central Building, Pune.
- 3) The Divisional Joint Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Sitabuldi, Nagpur, Tahsil and District Nagpur.

... Respondents

Shri A.M. Ghare, Advocate for petitioner.

Shri A.S. Fulzele, Additional Government Pleader for respondents.

CORAM : SUNIL B. SHUKRE AND
ANIL S. KILOR, JJ.

DATED : JUNE 23, 2021

ORAL JUDGMENT (PER SUNIL B. SHUKRE, J.) :

Hearing was conducted through Video Conferencing and the learned Counsel for the parties agreed that the audio and visual quality was proper.

2) Heard Shri Ghare, learned Counsel for the petitioner, and Shri Fulzele, learned Additional Government Pleader, who waives notice for the respondents.

3) Rule, returnable forthwith. Heard finally by consent of learned Counsel for the parties.

4) The petitioner has pressed for alternate prayer made in prayer clause (B) of the petition. The alternate prayer is a limited one and it seeks a decision from respondent no.2 on the proposal submitted by the petitioner Bank seeking his permission to make recruitment of the requisite manpower against the available posts within a period of two weeks.

5) It appears that there is already a proposal sent to the respondent no.2 by the petitioner Bank and there is also

recommendation given to the said proposal by the respondent no.3 stating that such sanction can be granted for filling up 99 posts. However, the proposal appears to be still pending with the respondent no.2. The purpose of this petition would be served, if necessary directions are issued to the respondent no.2.

6) Accordingly, petition is partly allowed. The respondent no.2 is directed to decide the proposal dated 20/12/2019 submitted by the petitioner in accordance with law in the light of the recommendations made by the respondent no.3 vide his communication dated 25/2/2020 and also representation dated 16/3/2020 of the petitioner, within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of this judgment.

7) Rule is made absolute in the above terms. No costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

khj