

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

**902 CIVIL APPLICATION NO.12184 OF 2023
IN REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) (ST)/22467/2023
IN WP NO. 1381/2022**

NAGRAJ JANARDAN PATIL
VERSUS
STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Mr. Nagraj Janardan Patil : Party In Person
AGP for Respondent/State : Mr. S.B. Yawalkar

...

**903 CIVIL APPLICATION NO.12192 OF 2023
IN REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) (ST)/22472/2023
IN WP NO. 8464/2021**

NAGRAJ JANARDAN PATIL
VERSUS
STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Mr. Nagraj Janardan Patil : Party In Person
AGP for Respondent/State : Mr. S.B. Yawalkar

**CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL &
S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 19.10.2023

PER COURT :

Heard the petitioner in person in respect of the review applications.

2. The petitioner had filed these Writ Petitions with following prayers :

Prayers in Writ Petition No. 1381/2022 :

“(c) By an appropriate order declare that order of suspension of efficiency bar and annual increment of petitioner are perverse as not based on legal and acceptable evidence.

(d) By an appropriate order declare that, order of

suspension of annual increment of petitioner dated 27.06.1997 signed by fraud and fictitious administrator A.K. Jeoph of respondent no. 4 is not legal and proper.

(e) Direct respondent no. 4 to pay all consequential benefits with arrears to the petitioner as if he was in the service of respondent no. 4 till the date of retirement (superannuation) with 24% interest p.a.

Prayers in Writ Petition No. 8464/2021 :

“(c) By an appropriate order declare that, charge-sheet dated 03.07.1996 is lacking legal episode and violation of jurisdiction of respondent no. 4.

(d) By an appropriate order declare that the finding of enquiry officer, thereby holding the petitioner guilty of the misconduct levelled against him in the charge-sheet are perverse as not based on legal and acceptable evidence.

(e) By an appropriate order declare that the termination order dated 18.12.1999 is not legal and proper.

(f) Direct respondent no. 4 to pay all consequential benefits with full back wages to the petitioner as if he was in the services of respondent no. 4 till the date of retirement (superannuation) with 24% interest p.a.

3. It appears that there were several disputes between the parties. The genesis of the dispute was the relationship of employer and employee. It seems that the parties had deliberated and evolved the terms of settlement. The respondent No. 5 which is a employer subsequently passed a resolution to offer him Rs. 10 lac as one time settlement. As can be seen, on insistence of the petitioner in person that the amount was insufficient, it was enhanced to Rs. 12 lac. The copy of the resolution was placed on record. The cheque was tendered towards full and final settlement. The petitioner was granted liberty to place some independent request for his claim regarding gratuity. Few other terms of settlement were also noted and by expressly observing that the parties having arrived at settlement that the writ petitions were disposed of.

4. If such is the state of affairs where it is a matter of proceeding of the Court reflected in the order under review, there cannot be any question of undertaking any review. The writ petitions having been disposed of on settlement, it would not lie in the realm of review jurisdiction.

5. The Civil Applications together with Review Applications are disposed of.

(S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, J.)

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)

mkd/-