



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 2129 OF 2024

Gururaj S/o Panchayya Swami
Age : 42 Years, Occ. : Service
R/o Gurukrupa Niwas, Vikas Nagar,
Deglur Road, Udgir,
Tq. Udgir, Dist. Latur

... PETITIONER

...VERSUS...

1. Maharashtra State Road Transport Corporation
Through its Divisional Controller
Divisional Office Latur.
2. Divisional Traffic Superintendent (Competent Authority)
Maharashtra State Road Transport
Corporation, Latur Division,
Latur.

... RESPONDENTS

Adv. N. L. Dhobale, Advocate for the Petitioner
Adv. N. T. Tribhuwan h/f. Mr. A. D. Wange, Advocate for
Respondent Nos. 1 and 2

CORAM : ROHIT W. JOSHI, J.
DATE : JULY 16, 2025

ORAL JUDGMENT:

1. The petitioner is working as Conductor with respondent no. 1. While he was discharging his duty as a Conductor on 08.05.2014 on a bus from Udgir to Aurad-Barhali route. The bus was checked at Aurad station. The raiding party found that the petitioner had collected amount from various passengers without issuing proper

ticket to them. Rs. 18/- were collected from 3 passengers travelling from Marpalli to Aurad to whom proper tickets were not issued. An endorsement was made on a plain paper regarding receipt of amount.

2. There were 5 other passengers to whom tickets were issued only 30 seconds before the checking squad arrived at Aurad. These passengers were travelling from Badalgaon to Aurad.

3. The checking party started surprise check at Aurad station, which implies that tickets to these 5 passengers were issued at the station, where they were to de-board the bus and obviously having seen the checking party approach. There is *prima facie* material against the petitioner, which does not warrant quashing the final show cause notice. The case is not one of no evidence. There is material on record, which the competent authority may evaluate to take appropriate decision. The learned counsel for the petitioner has advanced submissions with respect to the material on record and not with respect fairness of the proceedings. The learned Labour Court has rightly taken into consideration the aforesaid facts to hold that the petitioner has failed to make a case for seeking stay to the

second show cause notice. The Industrial Court has concurred with the finding recorded by the learned Labour Court.

4. In view of the above no case for interference is made out. The writ petition is, therefore, **dismissed**. Needless to mention that the observations are only for the purpose of deciding the present petition and the learned Court and authorities will not be influenced by the observations, while deciding the matter on merits.

5. At this stage, learned advocate for the petitioner makes a request for continuing the *interim* order. Having regard to the nature of the petition, which challenges a show cause notice in case of alleged misappropriation, the request is liable to be rejected.

[ROHIT W. JOSHI, J.]