



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

930 WRIT PETITION NO.13080 OF 2025

Ashish Bhaskar Gaikwad

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through The Secretary and Others

...

Mr. Kishor J. Ghute Patil, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. S. K. Tambe, Addl. GP for Respondent Nos.1 to 4/State.

Mr. A. R. Nikam, Advocate for Respondent No.5.

...

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.13144 OF 2025

Sachin Ashok Nirgude and Others

Versus

The State of Maharashtra Through Its Secretary and Others

...

Mr. Hanumant P. Jadhav, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. S. K. Tambe, Advocate for Respondent Nos.1 and 2/State.

Mr. A. R. Nikam, Advocate for Respondent No.3.

Mr. S. R. Dheple, Advocate for Respondent No.4.

...

CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &

HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.

DATE : 06 NOVEMBER 2025

ORDER :

. Heard.

2. Issue notice to the respondents in both the writ petitions. Learned Additional Government Pleader waives notice for respondent Nos.1 to 4 in

Writ Petition No.13080 of 2025 and for respondent Nos.1 and 2 in Writ Petition Nos.1 and 2. Learned Advocate Mr. A. R. Nikam waives notice for respondent No.5 in Writ Petition No.13080 of 2025 and for respondent No.3 in Writ Petition No.13144 of 2025 and learned Advocate Mr. S. R. Dheple waives notice for respondent No.4 in Writ Petition No.13144 of 2025. Notice of respondent No.6 in Writ Petition No.13080 of 2025 is made returnable on 28.11.2025.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioners in both the matters would rely on the decision of this Court by the Co-ordinate Bench at Principal Seat at Bombay on 16.10.2025 in **Writ Petition No.13519 of 2025 and companion matters (Nitin Raju Kokatare and Ors. Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others)**, wherein similarly situated persons had approached and following order has been passed :-

“10. In the meanwhile, we direct that the Petitioners, or similarly situated candidates, shall be permitted to file their applications for consideration for promotion to the post of Cluster Head/Kendra Pramukh. In the event any of them is selected in the promotional exercise, until these Petitions are decided, no rights would be created in favour of such candidates and any such selection would be subject to the result of these Petitions.”

4. We are of the opinion that the petitioners are covered in the said order and, therefore, there is no necessity to pass a separate order.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm