

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

933 WRIT PETITION NO. 1852 OF 2020

**VARSHA VAIJANATH PAWAR AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS**

...

Mr. M.S. Choudhari, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Ravi Bangar, Advocate for respondent No.1.
Mr. N.S. Choudhari, Advocate for respondent No.2.

...

**CORAM : R.G. AVACHAT AND
SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, JJ.**

DATED : 9 APRIL 2025

P.C. :

1. Writ petition has been filed for setting aside the oral order of termination of petitioners services dated 16.11.2019.
2. Petitioners claimed to have served with respondent No.2 Airport Authority of India at the Airport at Aurangabad. They claimed to have been abruptly terminated for no fault on their part. Our attention has been drawn to the complaint made by the petitioners and other similarly placed working women alleging that certain staff members did not allow them to perform house keeping duty in the Airport Department.
3. Respondent No.2 has filed affidavit in reply with a specific averment that none of the petitioner was directly engaged by it. It has been specifically averred that respondent

No.3 is the subsequent Contractor. The petitioners were serving through the earlier Contractor whose contract period has already come to an end wayback on 15.11.2019. Thereafter respondent No.3 Contractor was engaged to supply the employees. The petitioners have not been engaged to serve with respondent No.2 through respondent No.3 any time.

4. Petitioners in their complaint had specifically admitted that previous Contractor Mohankumar had continued them in service, but the second Contractor Sachidanand Shetty has not continued and regularise them. As such, the petitioners admit to have been employed through a Contractor of whose contract period came to an end long before. As such, the services of the petitioners were coterminous with the contract period through whom they were engaged to serve at the Airport. The petitioners have failed to make out any right to render services with the Airport Authority of India/respondent No.2. For all these reasons, the petition lacks the merit and the same is therefore dismissed.

(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.)

(R.G. AVACHAT,J.)