

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

Writ Petition No. 2416 of 2019
With
Contempt Petition No.36 of 2024
In
Writ Petition No. 2416 of 2019

Urmila Krishna Sathe ... Petitioner.
V/s.
State of Maharashtra and Ors. ... Respondents.

With
Interim Application(l) No. 11116 of 2024
In
Contempt Petition No.36 of 2024
In
Writ Petition No. 2416 of 2019

Urmila Krishna Sathe ... Applicant

In the matter between

Urmila Krishna Sathe ... Petitioner
v/s.
State of Maharashtra & Others ... Respondents

Mr. Abhishek Tripathi for the Petitioner in both petitions.

Mr. Abhay Patki, Addl. GP for Respondent Nos. 1 & 4 in WP
No.2416/2019.

Mr. Rui Rodrigues for Respondent No.2 in WP No.2416/19.

Mr. Ashutosh Kulkarni a/w. Gaurav Sharma for Respondent No.3 in
both petitions.

**CORAM : NITIN JAMDAR, AND
M.M. SATHAYE, JJ.**

DATE : 19 June 2024.

P.C. :

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The Petitioner has filed this writ petition challenging the advertisement issued by Respondent No.3 on 27 July 2017 in respect of the posts specified therein. The Petitioner who is working as Junior Engineer in Respondent No.3 - Institute has challenged this advertisement on the premise that the advertisement is depriving the candidates such as the Petitioner of right to apply. As regards the prayer in respect of Petitioner's services are concerned, the prayer is only to decide Petitioner's representation.

3. The Contempt Petition is filed by the Petitioner making a grievance that, the ad-interim order passed in the Writ Petition whereby the Division Bench had directed Respondent No.3 not to make appointments in violation of G.R. dated 6 May 2017 till further orders, is not complied with. It is the stand of Respondent No.3, the appointments were made earlier to this order dated 1 April 2022. The main grievance of the Petitioner centers around the Petitioner's claim to the post. In the petition, relief sought for is decision to be taken on representation. In this representation, the Petitioner has put forth all his grievances and if the representation is decided favourably, the proceedings would come to an end and if it is decided against the Petitioner, the Petitioner would then have a reasoned decision on her claim to which Petitioner would have

remedies open.

4. In these circumstances, we deem it appropriate to direct Respondent No.3 to decide the Petitioner's representation referred to in the Writ Petition and Contempt Petition within a period of six weeks from today. If the Petitioner's representation is to be negated then reason be given. The Petitioner thereupon would have remedies open.

5. In the light of this order passed in the Writ Petition, it is not necessary to proceed further in contempt jurisdiction. Both, the Writ Petition and the Contempt Petition, are disposed of in the above terms.

6. Pending Interim Application also stands disposed of.

(M.M. SATHAYE, J.)

(NITIN JAMDAR, J.)

L.S. Panjwani, P.S.