

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 12661 OF 2024

Yusra Tanveer Shamlik and Others

... Petitioners

versus

The State of Maharashtra and Others

... Respondents

....

Mr.Akhil Kupade for the Petitioners.

Ms.Pooja Joshi Deshpande, AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 to 5-State.

....

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
M.M. SATHAYE, JJ.**

DATE : 23RD OCTOBER, 2024

P.C.:

1. This is a motion for speaking to the minutes of the judgment dated 15th October, 2024.

2. It is pointed out that the Petition was filed by the Petitioners with the grievance that Petitioner No.1 was not being granted the Shalarth-ID. Inadvertently, it is typed in paragraphs 3 and 5 that the impugned order pertains to refusal of approval to the appointment of Petitioner No.1.

3. In view of the above, **this motion is allowed.**

4. Paragraph 3 of the judgment dated 15th October, 2024 shall read as under :

“3. We have heard the learned Advocates for the respective sides. The impugned order dated 22nd November, 2023 reveals that the Shalarth-ID of Petitioner No.1, was refused for the reason that, (1) the staffing pattern was not annexed to the proposal, (2) the recruitment was carried out during the Covid ban and (3) the proposal is belatedly forwarded on 6th March, 2023”.

5. Paragraph 5 of the judgment dated 15th October, 2024 shall read as under :

“5. Insofar as the issue of the proposal having been tendered belatedly, we do not find that it could be an embargo for considering the proposal for grant of Shalarth-ID, inasmuch as, such delay of around 18 months cannot lead to the rejection of the proposal and the quashing of the appointment order.”

6. The correction be carried out accordingly and the corrected order be uploaded.

(M.M. SATHAYE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)