



(1)

934wp2835.24

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

934 WRIT PETITION NO. 2835 OF 2024

RAJU GIRDHAR PAWAR

....Petitioner

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH THE SECRETARY
AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

Mr. Sandip A. Wakle, Advocate h/f Mr. S. M. Kamble, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. P. K. Lakhotiya, AGP for the Respondents/State

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
R. M. JOSHI, JJ.**

DATE : 14th MARCH, 2024

P. C.

1. The Petitioner has putforth prayer clauses-(B) & (C)
as under:-

B] The application sent by the petitioner dated 06-06-2023 to the Resp. No.1 and 2 may be directed to decide or accept, by issuing a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or directions in the nature of a writ of Mandamus.

C] The respondent No.2 may please be directed to initiate action U/s. 84 of the Disability Rights Act, 2016 accordingly.

2. The Petitioner is the head of the Economics Department in A.S.S.P Mandal Dhadgaon Sanchalit, Maharaja J. P. Valvi Arts, Commerce and Shri. V. K. Kulkarni Science College, Dhadgaon, Dist. Nandurbar. He alleges that a co-teacher, namely Suresh Patil is troubling him mentally and physically. It is mentioned in the complaint that various colleagues directly or indirectly harass the petitioner. He is partially deaf. Whenever he interacts on whats-app with his colleagues, nobody offers him a straight answer and they try to jeer him. Convener of the 'NAAC' committee makes improper allegations against him. Convener suffers from diabetes and blood pressure and wife of the said convener questions as to whether anybody can bring back her husband if he suffers an attack or an un-toward situation. The Petitioner is afraid that if said convener suffers a heart attack, he may be held responsible. The entire complaint has various such type of grievances.

3. We do not find that Section 82 or 84 of the Rights of

Persons with Disability Act, 2016 would be attracted in this matter with reference to this complaint.

4. **The Writ Petition is devoid of merits and is disposed off.**

5. This was a fit case to impose exemplary cost. However, though the petitioner is head of the Economics Department of a reputed college, we are not imposing cost as his lawyer has urged us to pardon him.

[R. M. JOSHI, J.]

[RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.]

VishalK/934wp2835.24