

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR**

WRIT PETITION NO. 837 OF 2021

1. Anandrao Bhiwaji Bawane,
Aged about - 66 years, Occ. Retired,
R/o At Thanegaon, Post Thanegaon,
Tah. Armori, Dist. Gadchiroli.
2. Shobha Laxman Rasekar,
Aged about - 66 years, Occ. Retired,
R/o At Kumbhar Mohalla Armori,
Tah. Armori, Dist. Gadchiroli.
3. Tulshiram Waraluji Bhurse,
Aged about - 66 years, Occ. Retired,
R/o At Thanegaon, Post Thanegaon,
Tah. Armori, Dist. Gadchiroli.
4. Pratima Pramodrao Changale,
Aged about - 63 years, Occ. Retired,
R/o At Shakti Nagar, Armori,
Tah. Armori, Dist. Gadchiroli.
5. Lila Laxmanrao Hemake (Dhatrak),
Aged about - 66 years, Occ. Retired,
R/o At Tadurwar Nagar, Armori,
Po-Tah. Armori, Dist. Gadchiroli.
6. Vimal Bhaurao Shende @ Varsha
Chandrakant Bhalme,
Aged about-60 years, Occu-Retired,
R/o Maa Durga Nivas, Sainagar,
Behind Carmel Convent,
Gadchiroli, Dist. Gadchiroli.

.... PETITIONERS

// VERSUS //

1. State of Maharashtra,
through its Secretary,
Rural Development and Water
Conservation Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

2. State of Maharashtra
through its Secretary,
School Education and Sports
Department, Mantralaya,
Mumbai-32.
3. Divisional Commissioner,
Nagpur Division Nagpur,
Tq. and Dist. Nagpur.
4. Zilla Parishad, Gadchiroli
through its Chief Executive
Officer, Gadchiroli,
Tq. and Dist. Gadchiroli.
5. Education Officer (Primary),
Zilla Parishad, Gadchiroli,
Tq. and Dist. Gadchiroli.

.... **RESPONDENTS**

Shri A. R. Deshpande, Advocate for petitioners.

Shri A. M. Deshpande, Additional Government Pleader for
respondent Nos.1 to 3.

Shri Ashish W. Paunikar, Advocate for respondent Nos.4 and 5.

CORAM: A.S. CHANDURKAR AND
G. A. SANAP, JJ.
DATED : 18/02/2022.

JUDGMENT : (PER G. A. SANAP, J.)

1. **Rule.** Rule is made returnable forthwith. Heard
finally by consent of learned Advocates for the parties.

2. It is the case of the petitioners that they were the
employees of schools in Zilla Parishad, Gadchiroli. They were

selected as the District Awardee Teachers in different years up to 2017 and some of them have retired. As per the Government Circular dated 12/12/2000, a specific provision has been made that the Awardee Teachers would be entitled to additional increment which is independent of the yearly increment. It is the grievance of the petitioners that without any justifiable reason, the monetary benefits of one additional increment have not been granted to them.

3. We have heard the learned Advocates for the parties.

4. The learned Advocate for the petitioners pointed out that the issue involved in this petition has already been covered by the Judgment of this Court in Writ Petition No.205/2021 (Yeleshwar Ankaiahji Komarewar and others Vrs. State of Maharashtra and others) dated 07/09/2021 and also in other identical matters from other Districts. Perusal of the petition indicates that the disputed facts of this case are identical with the facts involved in the Judgment of this Court

in Writ Petition No.205/2021 dated 07/09/2021. In our view, therefore, since the issue is squarely covered by the above decision, it is necessary to allow the petition. The petition is accordingly allowed.

5. The respondent No.4 after satisfying themselves about the petitioners being District Awardee Teachers as per circular dated 04/09/2018 shall individually consider the case of the petitioners for additional increment as laid down in the Government Resolution dated 12/12/2000. It is made clear that the same shall be considered on merits of each individual case by considering the Judgments rendered in all the applicable cases. The exercise be undertaken expeditiously and in any case within a period of six months.

6. Rule is made absolute in above terms with no order as to costs.

(G. A. SANAP, J.)

(A.S. CHANDURKAR, J.)

Choulwar

VITHAL
MAROTRAO
CHOULWAR

Digitally signed by
VITHAL MAROTRAO
CHOULWAR
Date: 2022.02.22
18:37:57 +0530