



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL WRIT JURISDICTION

REVIEW PETITION (W) NO. 19/2024 IN WRIT PETITION NO. 2675/2021 (D)

(AYESHA BABU KHAN **VERSUS** THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA & OTHERS)

*Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
 appearances, Court's orders of directions
 and Registrar's orders.*

Court's or Judge's order

Shri Hamza Lakdawala a/w Mohammed Najmi, counsel for the petitioner.
 Ms Jyoti Chawan, Additional Government Pleader for the respondent no.1.
 Dr.Ms Daizy Kulkarni, representative of the respondent no.2-Sabha.
 Ms Shilpa Redkar, counsel for the respondent no.3-MCGM.

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE AND SHARMILA U. DESHMUKH, JJ.

DATE : JANUARY 16, 2025

P. C.

We have heard the counsel for the respective parties through virtual mode.

2. The writ petition was preferred by the review petitioner seeking enquiry against the Office bearers of the respondent no.2- Mumbai Pradesh Arya Vidya Sabha of which she was an employee. Amongst other, the grievance made was not honouring her terminal dues. The writ petition came to be disposed of *vide* order dated December 14, 2022.

3. We have heard the counsel for the petitioner for some time.

4. The reliefs which are claimed through the review petition are not in tune with the main relief claimed by the petitioner in the writ petition. Apart from above, the review petitioner was paid all the terminal dues on the date of the order which is under review.

5. Though the counsel for the review petitioner has claimed that the terminal dues were accepted in the form of cheques by the counsel appearing for the petitioner at the relevant time without any instructions, such act cannot be said to be contrary to the interest of the petitioner as a grievance was made through the petition that the terminal dues which were due and receivable by the petitioner were not paid.

6. In this background, the grievance, if any, in relation to the inadequate payment of terminal dues or any other relief in relation to the service conditions of the petitioner, could have been agitated before the appropriate forum. Leaving such option open to the review petitioner, we deem it fit to dismiss the review petition.

7. The review petition as such stands dismissed. No costs.

(SHARMILA U. DESHMUKH, J.)

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)