



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 11772 OF 2023
IN WRIT PETITION NO. 3217 OF 2023

Govind Balaprasad Karwa,
Age : 44 yeas, Occu. Lawyer,
R/o Flat No. 103, Raj Residency – O,
Jijaunagar, near Ananadnagar, Nanded

... APPLICANT

Versus

1. Nanded-Waghala Shahar Mahanagarpalika
Kamgar Karmachari Union,
Having its Registered Office at Trade Union
Center, Kamgar Bhawan, Mahavir Nagar,
Nanded,
Through its President,
Ganesh Rama Shinge,
Age : 59 years, Occ.: Service,
R/o As above

2. The State of Maharashtra
Through its Secretary
Urban Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai

3. Nanded-Waghala Municipal Corporation
Nanded Through its Commissioner

... RESPONDENTS

Mr. S. S. Bora, Advocate for the Applicant

Mr. S. K. Tambe, Advocate for Respondent No1/State

Mr. S. R. Shirsat, Advocate h/f Mr. R. K. Ingole, Advocate for Respondent
No.2

Mr. Parag Barde, Advocate for the Petition in Writ Petition No. 3217 of
2023.

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE AND
R. M. JOSHI, JJ.

DATED 5th APRIL, 2024

ORDER (PER – R. M. JOSHI, J.) :-

1. This Application is filed by Govind Balaprasad Karwa seeking permission to intervene in Writ Petition No. 3217 of 2023. It is the case of the Applicant that he was appointed as a Public Relation Officer and has continuously worked with one day gap in six months. He claims to have been terminated on 20th August, 2014. His request for reconsideration of the said termination was rejected by the Corporation. Applicant claims to be aggrieved by the Government Resolution dated 14th February, 2023 and hence, he intends to contribute additional grounds of challenge, to the said Government Resolution.

2. There is no dispute about the fact that the Applicant seeks intervention in the Writ Petition for supporting the Petitioner. Learned Advocate for the Applicant as well as the Petitioner contended that the Applicant is having documents which would be useful for the decision of the Petition and hence, the application for intervention is asked to be allowed.

3. Perusal of the Application shows that the grievance of the Applicant is individual centric. It is always open for him to ventilate his grievance by initiating appropriate independent proceeding. As far as the documents sought to be produced along with the Application are concerned, they are public documents. If the Petitioner is interested in taking assistance of these documents, it is always open for him to seek

the same from the Applicant in order to place them on record.

4. For the purpose of deciding intervention Application the relevant consideration would be as to whether the presence of the Applicant is necessary for the just decision of the Petition. Except for the individual grievances the Application filed by Applicant does not in any manner show that his presence would be absolutely necessary for the purpose of decision of the Petition. We find that neither he is 'necessary party' nor 'proper party' to permit him to intervene in this Petition. In such circumstances no case is made out by the Applicant for permitting his intervention in the present Petition.

5. It is, however, clarified that the rejection of this Application will not become an impediment for the Applicant to pursue his grievance in accordance with law.

6. Hence, **this Civil Application is disposed off.**

(R. M. JOSHI, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

ssp