

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

**REVIEW PETITION NO.14 OF 2012**  
**ALONG WITH**  
**CHAMBER SUMMONS NO.135 OF 2012**  
**IN**  
**WRIT PETITION NO.1873 OF 2011**

Dr. Gulnar Sharma

.. Petitioner–Applicant

Vs.

Vice Chancellor,

Shreemati Nathibai Damodar Thackersey

Women’s University, Mumbai and Ors.

.. Respondents

None for the Petitioner–Applicant.

Mr. Rui Rodrigues, with Mr. Jainendra Sheth, for the Respondents.

**CORAM : SUNIL B. SHUKRE & RAJESH S. PATIL, JJ**

**DATE : 8<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST, 2023.**

**P.C. :**

1. Petitioner–applicant is not present. Mr. Rui Rodrigues, learned counsel appearing for the respondents, is present and points out that due to subsequent developments, which occurred after filing of the review petition, this review petition has been rendered infructuous. In support, he invites our attention to the Office Order dated 27<sup>th</sup> April 2012, annexed at page 9 to the Chamber Summons No.135 of 2012.

2. The Office Order dated 27<sup>th</sup> April 2012 shows that the service of the petitioner has been terminated with effect from the close of office hours of 27<sup>th</sup> April 2012. What has been questioned in this review petition is the view taken by this court regarding relegating the petitioner to the Grievance Committee for redressal of her grievance arising from the order extending her probation period and according to the petitioner, there is a manifest error in the order dated 19<sup>th</sup> October 2011.

3. However, now, the issue regarding legality or otherwise of the order extending promotion has merged into the final order of termination of service of the petitioner and unless and until the final order of termination of the service of the petitioner dated 27<sup>th</sup> April 2012 is challenged, no relief, in a review petition like this, can be granted to the petitioner. That would mean that the petitioner now has a fresh cause of action accrued to her, on the basis of which the petitioner would be at liberty to proceed in accordance with law. With these observations, the review petition is dismissed as infructuous.

4. Chamber Summons No.135 of 2012 would also not survive and it is disposed of accordingly.

[ RAJESH S. PATIL, J. ]

[ SUNIL B. SHUKRE, J. ]