

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.10381 OF 2010

Bhagawat Dagadu Kshirsagar

.. Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra and Anr.

.. Respondents

None for the Petitioner.

Mr. N.C. Walimbe, Addl. G.P., with Ms. K.N. Solunke, AGP for Respondent No.1-
State.

Mr. N.V. Bandiwadkar, Sr. Advocate, with Mr. Vinayak Kumbhar and Mr. R.B.
Khaire, for Respondent No.2.

**CORAM : A.S. CHANDURKAR &
JITENDRA JAIN, JJ**

DATE : 3RD JANUARY, 2024.

P.C. :

1. There is no appearance on behalf of the petitioner. However, with the assistance of learned AGP appearing for respondent no.1 and Mr. Bandiwadkar, learned Senior Advocate appearing for respondent no.2, we have perused the record. By an order dated 6th August 2010, the services of the 2nd respondent came to be transferred on the post that was held by the petitioner. The respondent no.2 being aggrieved by the order of transfer, approached the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal and challenged the same. The Tribunal by its order dated 16th November 2010 set aside the order of transfer. Being aggrieved, the petitioner approached this Court by filing the present Writ Petition.

2. On 13th January 2011, while issuing notice in the Writ Petition, a direction to maintain status-quo as of that date was issued. Subsequently, on 23rd September 2011, the order of status-quo was clarified by stating that the same would not come in the way of respondent no.1 passing a general transfer order. It is informed by the learned Senior Advocate for respondent no.2 that subsequently the respondent no.2 has been transferred on three to four occasions.

3. We find that with the passage of time, the grievance against the order passed by the Tribunal would not now survive. It is likely that even the petitioner may have been subsequently transferred. In that view of the matter, the Writ Petition is disposed of as having served its purpose. Rule is discharged. No costs.

[JITENDRA JAIN, J.]

[A.S. CHANDURKAR, J.]