

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

958 WRIT PETITION NO.12389 OF 2024

Shivaji Shriram Jadhav

..Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

Through The Secretary and Others

..Respondents

.....

Shri. Pradeep B. Kulkarni h/f. Shri. S. A. Nagarsoge, Advocate for the
Petitioner

Shri. P. S. Patil, Addl. G. P. for the Respondent / State.

Shri. P. D. Suryawanshi, Advocate for Respondent Nos.5 to 7

.....

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.12393 OF 2024

Ashok Parasram Rathod

.. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

Through The Secretary and Others

..Respondents

.....

Shri. Pradeep B. Kulkarni h/f. Shri. S. A. Nagarsoge, Advocate for the
Petitioner

Shri. P. S. Patil, Addl. G. P. for the Respondent / State.

Shri. P. D. Suryawanshi, Advocate for Respondent Nos.5 to 7

.....

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.12414 OF 2024

Chandrashekhar Panditrao Aher

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

Through The Secretary and Others

..Respondents

.....

Shri. Pradeep B. Kulkarni h/f. Shri. S. A. Nagarsoge, Advocate for the
Petitioner

Shri. P. S. Patil, Addl. G. P. for the Respondent / State.

Shri. P. D. Suryawanshi, Advocate for Respondent Nos.5 to 7

.....

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.9179 OF 2024

Kalyan Saudarinath Walekar

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

Through the Secretary and Others

... Respondents

.....

Shri. Pradeep B. Kulkarni h/f. Shri. S. A. Nagarsoge, Advocate for the
Petitioner

Shri. P. S. Patil, Addl. G. P. for the Respondent / State.

Shri. P. D. Suryawanshi, Advocate for Respondent No. 5

Shri. A. R. Nikam, Advocate for Respondent No.6

.....

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.9009 OF 2024

Bhagwan Gowardhan Rathod

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

Through the Secretary and Others

... Respondents

.....

Shri. Pradeep B. Kulkarni h/f. Shri. S. A. Nagarsoge, Advocate for the
Petitioner

Shri. P. S. Patil, Addl. G. P. for the Respondent / State.

Shri. P. D. Suryawanshi, Advocate for Respondent No. 5

Shri. A. R. Nikam & Shri. S. E. Madne, Advocate for Respondent No.6

.....

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.9135 OF 2024

Bappasaheb Pandurang Pattekar

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

Through the Secretary and Others

... Respondents

.....

Shri. Pradeep B. Kulkarni h/f. Shri. S. A. Nagarsoge, Advocate for the
Petitioner

Shri. P. S. Patil, Addl. G. P. for the Respondent / State.

Shri. P. D. Suryawanshi, Advocate for Respondent No. 5

Shri. A. R. Nikam, Advocate for Respondent No.6

.....

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.9095 OF 2024

Rahul Laxman Chavan

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

Through the Secretary and Others

... Respondents

.....

Shri. Pradeep B. Kulkarni h/f. Shri. S. A. Nagarsoge, Advocate for the
Petitioner

Shri. P. S. Patil, Addl. G. P. for the Respondent / State.

Shri. P. D. Suryawanshi, Advocate for Respondent No. 5

Shri. A. R. Nikam, Advocate for Respondent No.6

.....

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.9024 OF 2024

Appasaheb Narhari Mule

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

Through the Secretary and Others

... Respondents

.....

Shri. Pradeep B. Kulkarni h/f. Shri. S. A. Nagarsoge, Advocate for the
Petitioner

Shri. P. S. Patil, Addl. G. P. for the Respondent / State.

Shri. P. D. Suryawanshi, Advocate for Respondent No. 5

Shri. A. R. Nikam, Advocate for Respondent No.6

.....

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.8400 OF 2022

Atul Kishanrao Solanke

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra

Through its Secretary and Others

... Respondents

.....

Shri. Pradeep B. Kulkarni h/f. Shri. S. A. Nagarsoge, Advocate for the Petitioner

Shri. P. S. Patil, Addl. G. P. for the Respondent / State.

Shri. P. D. Suryawanshi, Advocate for Respondent No. 5

Shri. S. R. Yadav, Shri. P. B. Vikhe, Shri. A. R. Nikam, Advocate for Respondent No.6

.....

**CORAM : R. G. AVACHAT AND
NEERAJ P. DHOTE, JJ.**

Dated : JUNE 10, 2025

FINAL ORDER :-

. Writ Petition Nos.9179 of 2024, 9009 of 2024, 9135 of 2024, 9095 of 2024, 9024 of 2024 and 8400 of 2022 are not on Board. Upon being mentioned, taken on Board.

2. The Petitioners, who are working as the Assistant Teachers in the respective Zilla Parishads, were terminated from their services. However, subsequently, the Petitioners were reinstated in their services. The Petitioners are claiming continuity of service. The Petitioners have made their Representations to the respective Zilla Parishads with a prayer to grant continuity of service. There is no dispute that the said Representations are still pending for consideration. This Court in identical Petition, wherein the similarly situated Petitioners had

submitted their Representation for continuity of service, had directed the concerned Authority i.e. Zilla Parishad to reconsider the issue of grant of continuity of service on its own merits and in the face of the order passed by the Additional Commissioner within the stipulated time.

3. The learned Advocates appearing for the parties submit that the Petitions can be disposed off by directing the concerned Zilla Parishads where the Representation of the Petitioners' for continuity of service are pending, to decide the same within stipulated time.

4. In view of the above factual aspects, we Dispose Off the Petitions by directing the respective Zilla Parishads to consider the Representations of the Petitioners for continuity of service, on its own merits and in accordance with law, within a period of six (6) weeks from the date of receipt of the order of this Court.

5. Petitions stand disposed off accordingly.

(NEERAJ P. DHOTE, J.)

(R. G. AVACHAT, J.)

GGP