

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

921 REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO.57 OF 2022
IN WRIT PETITION NO.8752/2021

THE SECRETARY, STATE BOARD, PUNE
VERSUS
RAMDAS KONDIRAM GAWALE & OTHERS

...

Advocate for the applicant : Mr.Kiran Gandhi h/f.
Mr.R.S.Wani

AGP for Respondent-State : Mr.S.P.Tiwari

...

AND

REVIEW APPLICATION NO.58 OF 2022
IN WRIT PETITION NO.8744 OF 2021

THE SECRETARY, STATE BOARD, PUNE
VERSUS
DATTU RAMESH INGLE & OTHERS

...

Advocate for the applicant : Mr.Kiran Gandhi h/f.
Mr.R.S.Wani

AGP for Respondent-State : Mr.S.P.Tiwari

...

AND

REVIEW APPLICATION NO.59 OF 2022
IN WRIT PETITION NO.8756 OF 2021

THE SECRETARY, STATE BOARD, PUNE
VERSUS
GOPAL SHESHRAO PAWAR & OTHERS

...

Advocate for the applicant : Mr.Kiran Gandhi h/f.
Mr.R.S.Wani

AGP for Respondent-State : Mr.S.P.Tiwari

...

AND

922 REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO.60 OF 2022
IN WRIT PETITION NO.10557 OF 2021

THE SECRETARY, STATE BOARD PUNE
VERSUS
SAMADHAN BABURAO MORE AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for the applicant : Mr.Kiran Gandhi h/f.
Mr.R.S.Wani

AGP for Respondent-State : Mr.S.P.Tiwari

...

**CORAM : S.V.GANGAPURWALA &
S.G.DIGE, JJ.**

DATE : 25.02.2022

P.C. :

1] Heard learned counsel for the applicant.

2] Learned counsel for the review applicant submits that this Court vide order under review has specified the time limit for submission of validity certificates to respondent no.1. Learned counsel further submits that if the validation proceedings are not decided by the Committee within 6 months, the applicant will have to continue the original writ petitioners on supernumerary posts and then the original writ petitioners can seek benefit of Government Resolution dated 21st November, 2019 and thereafter the applicant will have to place the original writ petitioners on supernumerary posts.

3] The present review applications are misplaced and misconceived. The appointments directed to be given to the original writ petitioners are subject to the validity certificates to be produced. It is for the Committee to decide the validation proceedings. Till vigilance is completed and vigilance report is served upon the person, that the person has no role to play in the validation proceedings.

4] The review applicant is arguing on assumptions. This Court vide order under review has not observed that if the original writ petitioners failed to produce validity certificates within specified time, they have to be placed on supernumerary posts or otherwise. This Court vide order under review has only observed that in case the petitioners are otherwise eligible, then the respondents may not withhold the appointment orders of the petitioners only on the ground that the validity certificate is not submitted.

5] In view of above, no case for review is made out. Review Applications are dismissed.

[S.G.DIGE, J.]

[S.V.GANGAPURWALA, J.]