



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

1017 WRIT PETITION NO. 297 OF 2023

PRADEVI GANPATRAO BANDGAR

VERSUS

**THE PRESIDENT SANGMESHAWAR
SHISHAN PRASARAK MANDAL AND OTHERS**

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Dhengle Babasaheb A.

Advocate for Respondent No.2 : Mr. Mayur V. Salunke

Advocate for Respondent No.3 : Mr. Suraj R. Bagal h/f. Mr. Gadegaonkar B.N.

Advocate for Respondent No.4 : Mr. Tandale Pradeepkumar R.

...

CORAM : SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.

DATE : 10.12.2025

PER COURT :

. Heard learned counsel for respective sides.

2. By way of present petition, the petitioner challenges the order dated 04.10.2022 passed by the learned Appellate Authority and Regional Deputy Commissioner, Social Welfare department, Latur in Appeal No.03/2021 whereby, the appeal filed by the petitioner came to be dismissed.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the management submits that the petitioner had approached to the authority by filing appeal by challenging theory of oral termination, but service of the petitioner was terminated after conducting an enquiry. Petitioner ought to have taken a recourse to amend the appeal and challenge the said inquiry proceeding, but the same was not done and therefore, the appellate

authority has rightly dismissed the appeal of the petitioner.

4. I have gone through the order passed by Regional Deputy Commissioner, Latur. I deem it appropriate to direct the petitioner to amend the appeal and to direct the Regional Deputy Commissioner to decide the appeal thereafter, on its own merits. Therefore, it is necessary to quash and set-aside the order of appellate authority.

5. In view thereof, the Writ Petition is allowed. The order dated 04.10.2022 passed by the learned Appellate Authority and Regional Deputy Commissioner, Social Welfare department, Latur in Appeal No.03/2021 is quashed and set-aside.

5. Appeal filed before the appellate authority is restored to its original position.

6. The petitioner is at liberty to file an application for amendment and to challenge the written order of termination. Respondents are at liberty to file their written submissions, if they require.

7. Learned counsel for petitioner Mr. Dhengle submits that till date, the copy of termination order is not served upon the petitioner.

8. Therefore, counsel representing the respondent No.1 to serve the copy of termination order upon the petitioner and thereafter, the petitioner to file an application for amendment.

9. If the petitioner files application for amendment, the appellate

authority to decide the same within a period of three months thereafter on its own merits without being influenced by the earlier order passed by it or by order passed by this Court.

10. All the points are kept open.

(SIDDHESHWAR S. THOMBRE, J.)

vsj..