

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

**911 CONT. PETITION NO.135 OF 2021
IN WP/15119/2017**

**RAJENDRA VITTHAL DHAKE
VERSUS
SUJATA SHOUNIK AND OTHERS**

...
Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. S.B. Sontakke
AGP for Respondent/State : Mr. A.R. Kale
Advocate for Respondent Nos. 2 & 3 : Mr. M.S. Sonawane

...
**8 CONT. PETITION NO.370 OF 2020
IN WP/14950/2017**

**YOGESH JAYAJIRAO PATIL AND OTHERS
VERSUS
DR. BHAGWANTRAO NAMDEV PATIL AND ANOTHER**

...
Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. S. K. Mathpati
AGP for Respondent/State : Mr. A.R. Kale
Advocate for Respondent Nos. 1 & 2 : Mr. M.S. Sonawane

...
**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
ARUN R. PEDNEKER, JJ.**

DATED : SEPTEMBER 8th, 2022.

PER COURT :

1. The directions issued in the order dated 3rd April, 2019, passed by this Court in **Writ Petition No. 15119/2018 filed by Rajendra Vitthal Dhake and Ors. Vs. The State of Maharashtra and Ors.,** have not been complied with.

2. The directions issued by this Court in paragraph No. 3, read as under :-

"3. The Government Resolution dated 24.08.2017 will have prospective effect and not retrospective and

in that case benefit that was accorded to petitioners of excellent work in the year 2006, 2007 and 2008, shall not be withdrawn and if any recovery is made pursuant to the same, same shall be refunded to the petitioners.”

3. The learned advocate representing the Zilla Parishad submits that though this Court has not issued any time frame, the Zilla Parishad will never disobey the order of this Court.

4. In view of the above, the learned advocates for the petitioners submit that the petitioners would be satisfied, if a time frame is granted by this Court.

5. In view of the above, these petitions are disposed off, with a direction to the Zilla Parishad, to comply with the order reproduced above, as expeditiously as possible and in any case, on or before 30th December, 2022.

6. Needless to state, the compliance of the said order would be without prejudice to the review petition filed by the Zilla Parishad, seeking review of the said order. If the petitioners are found to be disentitled, they would refund the said amount within eight weeks.

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER J.]

[RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.]