



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

WRIT PETITION NO 5175 OF 2025

(Seema Manohar Gajbhiye and others Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others)

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. S.S. Sanyal, Advocate for petitioners.
Mr. D.P. Thakre, Addl. GP for respondent Nos. 1 to 3/State.

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

DATED : 10-09-2025.

Heard Mr. Sanyal, learned counsel for the petitioners.

2. In short, it is contention of learned counsel for petitioner that while considering the seniority quota of 25-33, ratio of direct recruits like the petitioners in the cadre of Tahsildar is not considered. He therefore, questions non implementation of Rule 4 of the Maharashtra Civil Services (Regulation of Seniority) Rules.

3. We have gone through the documents filed along with the writ petition. As the petitioners, who are Tahsildar, are employees of the State Government, they can raise their grievance before the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (MAT).

4. Mr. Sanyal, learned counsel, has during the course of hearing requested this Court that Original Application No. 246/2022 and C.A. No. 568/2023 (Ravindra Holi and Ors Vs. State of Maharashtra and others, Original Application No. 182/2023 (Purushottam Bhusari Vs. State of Maharashtra and Others and Original Application No. 90/2025 (Vaishakh Wahurwagh Vs. State of Maharashtra and others, involving similar issue, which are pending before the MAT, Nagpur, in the interest of justice, the MAT can be directed to be decided with time bound manner. Mr. Sanyal further states that though the learned tribunal is over burdened, in

peculiar facts and circumstances, the original applications, as stated above, can be directed to be decided within time bound period.

5. We have considered the contentions. We are also aware of the fact that learned tribunal, Nagpur is seisin with several matters and therefore, a direction cannot be issued to decide the aforesaid applications within time bound period but definitely a request can be made to the learned tribunal to decide the aforesaid Original Applications, expeditiously.

6. In the aforesaid background, learned counsel Mr. Sanyal seeks permission to withdraw the petition. The petition is therefore, allowed to be withdrawn and disposed of accordingly.

7. Learned Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal, Mumbai, Bench at Nagpur is requested to decide Original Application No. 246/2022 and C.A. No. 568/2023 (Ravindra Holi and Ors Vs. State of Maharashtra and others, Original Application No. 182/2023 (Purushottam Bhusari Vs. State of Maharashtra and Others and Original Application No. 90/2025 (Vaishakh Wahurwagh Vs. State of Maharashtra and others, expeditiously.

(RAJNISH R. VYAS, J)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J)