



- 1 -

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

909 WRIT PETITION NO. 10869 OF 2024

NAMDEV ASARAM GAIKWAD AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND
OTHERS

Mr.S.K.Mathpati, Advocate for the Petitioners.
Mr.P.D.Suryawanshi, Standing Counsel for Respondent Nos. 5 and 6.
Mr.M.M.Nerlikar, AGP for the Respondent/State.

(CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE AND
Y.G.KHOBRADE, JJ.)

DATE : OCTOBER 3, 2024

PER COURT :

1. All these Petitioners claim to have received their District Awards prior to 12.12.2000. The details read as under :-

Chart in respect of details of Petitioners' name, date of appointment, date of retirement and date of District Award :-

Sr. No.	Name of the Petitioners	Date of Appointment	Date of Retirement	Date of District Award
01.	Namdev s/o Asaram Gaikwad	16.11.1973	30.06.2011	1997-1998
02.	Neela Dattatray Tarakh	05.04.1979	31.12.2016	1995-1996
03.	Minaxi Sudhakar Rao Rakhe	11.12.1973	30.11.2004	1998-1999

04.	Jagannath s/o Vikram Ghuge	30.06.1971	31.03.2007	1994-1995
05.	Shrikrishana s/o Babasaheb Tarakh	11.01.1974	31.08.2011	1994-1995

2. In this Petition, the Petitioners are identically placed. All of them received the District Teachers Award prior to 12.12.2000. In several matters, this Court has concluded that *"the Respondent Zilla Parishad, after confirming itself of the Petitioner being a District Awardee Teacher prior to 04.09.2018, prior to his retirement, shall consider the case of the Petitioner for additional increment as laid down in the circular dated 12.12.2000. It is made clear that the Petitioner will not be entitled for actual monetary benefits till the date of his retirement. The additional increment shall be counted notionally. The benefit shall be given to the Petitioner for pension purpose."* (WP Nos. 12519/2019 and 9414/2021]. The learned Advocate for the Petitioners submits that the Petitioners are satisfied if the above order is made applicable to their cases.

3. The learned Advocate for the Zilla Parishad has vehemently opposed this Petition on the ground of delay and laches and submits that this Petition does not deserve to be considered. In the alternative,

he submits that the Petitioners may be deprived of the monetary benefits.

4. In view of the above, **this Writ Petition is disposed off** by adopting the above reproduced order. Consequentially, the impugned order is set aside to the extent of the Petitioners. The Zilla Parishad shall act accordingly.

(Y.G.KHOBRADE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)