



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 5384 OF 2024

Rajani Shivling Ghordade (now Rajani Rajeshwar Malage) -- Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Hon'ble Minister, Rural Development -- Respondents
Department, Maharashtra State, Mantralaya,
Mumbai – 400 032.
2. The Divisional Commissioner, Amravati
Division, Amravati.
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad,
Akola.
4. The Education Officer (Primary), Zilla
Parishad, Akola.

Mr. R.M. Pande, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. N.R. Rode, Assistant Government Pleader for the Respondent
nos.1 and 2.

CORAM : NITIN JAMDAR &
NITIN W. SAMBRE, JJ.

DATE : 10 SEPTEMBER 2024.

P. C. :

The Petitioner has challenged the orders passed by the Chief Executive Officer dated 22 November 2021 and Divisional Commissioner dated 29 March 2022 in this writ petition and for a prayer to reinstate the Petitioner in service.

2. The Petitioner has filed a Revision bearing No.385 of 2022 which is pending before the Hon'ble Minister from 2022.

It is because the Revision Application is not taken up by the Hon'ble Minister, the Petitioner is constrained to approach this Court challenging the orders of Chief Executive Officer and Divisional Commissioner.

3. Once a remedy is provided to the employee, it needs to be taken up at an early date. Therefore, according to us, the pendency of the Revision Application for almost two years, without even the stay application being considered, is not proper.

4. Therefore, we are constrained to direct the Respondent no.1 to decide the Revision Application within a period of six weeks from today. If the Revision Application, inspite of this order, is not decided within the stipulated period, it will be open for the Petitioner to approach this Court.

5. As regards the grievance of the Petitioner that the order passed in Writ Petition No. 956 of 2018 filed by the Petitioner earlier being misinterpreted by the Authorities, it is always open to the Petitioner to place before the Revisional Authority, which according to the Petitioner is the correct interpretation of the said order.

5. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

[NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.]

[NITIN JAMDAR, J.]