

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

921 WRIT PETITION NO.4921 OF 2022

Sangita Eknath Kirtishahi @ (Sangita Kiran Shinde)

Age : 40 years, Occu : Service,

R/o. Sathe Nagar, Near Dr. Ambedkar Statue,

Waluj, B.K., Aurangabad, Dist. Aurangabad

.. Petitioner

Versus

1. State of Maharashtra
Through Chief Secretary
Ministry of Women and Child Development
Mantralaya, Mumbai
2. Chief Executive Officer,
Zilla Parishad, Aurangabad
Dist. Aurangabad
3. Additional Chief Executive Officer,
Women and Child Development Dept.,
Zilla Parishad, Aurangabad
Dist. Aurangabad
4. Child Development Welfare Officer,
Project – 2, Tal. Gangapur, Dist. Aurangabad. .. Respondents

...

Advocate for Petitioner: Mr. Gajendra D. Jain h/f.

Mr. Deshmukh Saud A.N.

AGP for Respondent – State : Mr. A.S. Shinde

Advocate for Respondent Nos.2, 3 and 4 : Mr. Uttam B. Bondar

...

**CORAM : R.D. DHANUKA &
S. G. MEHARE, JJ.**

Dated : May 05, 2022

ORAL JUDGMENT (PER R.D. DHANUKA, J.) :-

. Rule.

2. Learned AGP Shri. A. S. Shinde waives service of notice

for respondent no.1 – State. Learned Counsel Shri. Uttam. B. Bondar waives service of notice for respondent nos.2 to 4. Rule made returnable forthwith. Taken up for final hearing by consent of the parties.

3. By this petition, the petitioner seeks order and direction against the respondent nos.3 and 4 to decide the applications dated 25.06.2018 and 27.12.2021 filed by the petitioner as expeditiously as possible in view of Government Resolution dated 13.08.2014.

4. There is no dispute that the said applications filed by the petitioner are pending before the respondent nos.3 and 4.

5. In view of above, the respondent nos.3 and 4 are directed to decide the applications dated 25.06.2018 and 27.12.2021 within a period of eight weeks from today.

6. The order that would be passed by the respondent nos.3 and 4 shall be communicated to the petitioner within one week from the date of passing of the order.

7. If the order that would be passed is adverse to the

interest of the petitioner, the petitioner would be at liberty to file appropriate proceedings challenging the said order.

8. This Court has not expressed any view on the merits of the applications dated 25.06.2018 and 27.12.2021 filed by the petitioner.

9. All the contentions are kept open.

10. Rule is made absolute in the aforesaid terms. No order as to costs.

(S. G. MEHARE, J.)

(R.D. DHANUKA, J.)

...