

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO.2375 OF 2019

(Dr. Kailash Kashinath Vairalkar vs. State of Maharashtra and others)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders Court's or Judge's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Shri N.S. Warulkar, Advocate for petitioner.

Smt. S.S. Jachak, Assistant Government Pleader for respondent
nos.1 and 2.

Shri T.M. Zaheer, Advocate for respondent nos.3 and 4.

CORAM : A.S. CHANDURKAR AND MRS.VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, JJ.

DATED : AUGUST 3, 2023

Heard the learned Counsel for the parties.

2) The petitioner, who was appointed as a Medical Officer with Zilla Parishad, Buldhana, claims entitlement to appropriate pay scale especially in the light of the Government Resolution dated 17/10/2014 issued by the respondent no.1 – Public Health Department. In the said Government Resolution, name of the petitioner is shown at serial no.515 and according to the petitioner, in view of the judgment of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal in Original Application No.469/2012 (Dr. Anilkumar Ramkrishna Tarale and others vs. The State of Maharashtra and others) decided on 4/1/2022, he is entitled to the grade pay of Rs.5400/- from 18/7/2013 onwards. In the service book of the petitioner, grade pay of Rs.6600/- has been shown to be granted from 1/7/2006. In this regard, the petitioner has made representations to the District Health

Officer, Zilla Parishad, Buldhana on 21/1/2017 as well as Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Buldhana on 23/3/2018.

3) Considering the alternate prayer made in the writ petition, the respondent nos.3 and 4 are directed to consider the aforesaid representations in the light of the request as made. The said representations be decided after giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner with liberty to place all relevant documents before the said respondents. Necessary decision be taken within a period of four weeks of receiving copy of this order. The decision taken be communicated to the petitioner. Needless to state that if the grievance of the petitioner subsists, he is free to take recourse to appropriate remedy in accordance with law. All contentions of the parties are kept open. The writ petition is disposed of.

JUDGE

JUDGE

khj