

Digitally signed
by BHARAT
DASHARATH
PANDIT
Date: 2024.03.15
14:50:08 +0530

seeking the relief of regularization of its members. The Industrial Court decided the complaint on 30/10/2010 in favour of the recognized Trade Union. The Respondent was thereafter absorbed on a Group-D post by an order dated 09/09/2015. The Respondent had approached the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal by preferring the Original Application No.785 of 2012 which came to be decided on 17/06/2016. After considering the order passed by the Industrial Court, the present Petitioners were directed to consider the case of the Respondent for being appointed on par with other similarly situated employees. Consequently, the Respondent came to be so appointed on 12/09/2016. Since the Respondent claims to have worked on the Group-D post from 01/07/1990, she sought to rely upon the Circular dated 01/10/2003 for the purposes of seeking deemed date of appointment. Before the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal, the Respondent restricted her claim for consideration from 20/02/1997 only for the purposes of pensionary benefits. That was the date when Respondent was granted regular appointment. The Tribunal after noting these facts coupled with limited prayer of benefit only for pensionary purposes without any arrears of pay, granted such relief.

3] We do not find that the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal committed any error of jurisdiction while holding the Respondent entitled for benefit of continuity of service from 20/02/1997 only for the purposes of grant of pensionary benefits. No arrears of pay have been granted. This is in terms of the Circular dated 01/10/2003 and Government Resolution dated 11/03/2016.

4] For the aforesaid reasons we are not inclined to interfere in exercise of writ jurisdiction. The writ petition stands dismissed with no order as to costs.

[JITENDRA JAIN, J.]

[A.S. CHANDURKAR, J.]