



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR.

WRIT PETITION NO.3965 of 2024

Dr. Varsha Vivek Vaidya vs. The State of Maharashtra and others
with

WRIT PETITION NO.3937 of 2024

Dr. Digambar Somaji Samarth vs. The State of Maharashtra and others
with

WRIT PETITION NO.4340 of 2024

Dr. Rajendra Rambhau Watane vs. The State of Maharashtra and others

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

Mr. A.J.Sheikh, Advocate for petitioner in all Writ Petitions.

Ms Kavita Bhongade, Assistant Government Pleader for respondent nos.1 and 2
in all writ petitions.

CORAM :- NITIN W. SAMBRE AND ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.

DATE :- 25th JULY, 2024

P C.

Since issue involved in all these writ petitions is identical, they are being heard together and decided by this common order.

2. For the sake of convenience, the facts in Writ Petition No.3965 of 2024 are taken into consideration.

3. The petitioner, who is a lecturer serving at respondent no.3- College sought extension of benefit of Government Resolution dated 12.08.2009 whereby re-fixation of pay is warranted.

4. It is claimed that the issue sought to be canvassed by the petitioners is covered by the judgment of Division Bench of the Bombay High Court at Aurangabad Bench delivered in Writ Petition No. 10283 of 2012 (*Sudamrao Keshawrao Aher and others vs. The State of Maharashtra and others*) with connected writ petitions, decided on 21.11.2013.

5. It is the case of the petitioners that applications/representation preferred by the petitioners on 12.02.2024 in the aforesaid background

is pending with the respondent no.2-Joint Director of Higher Education, Nagpur Division, Nagpur.

6. Ms Bhongade, learned Assistant Government Pleader appearing for the respondents-State submits that the Court may pass an appropriate order.

7. That being so, we deem it appropriate to direct the respondent no.2-Joint Director of Higher Education to decide pending applications/representations of the petitioners in the light of the observations made in the aforesaid judgment, within a period of three weeks from today and also release consequential benefits, if it is found that the petitioners are entitled for the same within a period of three months thereafter.

8. With these directions the writ petition stand disposed of. No orders as to costs.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)

Andurkar.