



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

WRIT PETITION NO.5882 OF 2018

RIYAZ AHMED KHAN S/O BISMILLA KHAN AND OTHERS

VS

REGISTRAR, DR. PANJABRAO DESHMUKH KRISHI VIDYAPEETH, AKOLA AND
ANOTHER

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

Court's or Judge's order

Ms S.W. Deshpande, Advocate for the petitioner/s
Mr. Abhay Sambre, Advocate for the respondent No.1

CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR AND RAJNISH R. VYAS, JJ.

DATE : 08.09.2025

1. Heard.
2. In this petition, the petitioners are claiming time bound promotion, relying upon Government Resolution (GR) dated 21.09.1999.
3. However, the same has been denied by the respondent, being the employer, on the ground that the said Government Resolution (GR) was subsequently withdrawn.
4. In reply to the same, the learned counsel for the petitioners argues that the petitioners were appointed on daily wages from the year 1975 and they were given order for work charge basis.
5. It is pointed that on 07.02.1979 a resolution was passed, giving benefit of increments in the time-scale of pay from 01.11.1978 and all the employees on work charge establishment were allowed to avail of the facilities and

concessions at par with the employees of the State Government and ZPs. The learned counsel for the petitioners, therefore, submits that the Government Resolution dated 21.09.1999, which provides for a time-bound promotion after completion of 12 years, would be applicable to the petitioners.

6. We do not find favour with the argument made by the learned counsel for the petitioners for the reason that though the GR dated 21.09.1999 was issued in respect of the employees of the Agricultural Universities or affiliated colleges, the said benefits of time bound promotion was withdrawn vide GR dated 20.07.2001 and 'Assured Career Progression Scheme' was made applicable.

7. Admittedly, the petitioners got superannuated in the year 2009 and there was no challenge raised to the GR dated 20.07.2001, withdrawing the benefits of time bound promotion.

8. In that view of the matter, since the petitioners are not entitled for benefits which petitioners are claiming by way of present petition, we do not find merit in the same and accordingly, the petition is **dismissed**.

(RAJNISH R. VYAS, J.)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)