



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

WRIT PETITION NO.1399/2025

Rabiya Bee Khan Vs. The Union of India 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. Sakshi Tiwari, Advocate for petitioner

Ms. Mugdha Chandurkar, Advocate for respondent nos.1 and 2.

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE & MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, JJ.
DATE : MARCH 25, 2025.

1. Heard.
2. It is the case of the petitioner that the father-in-law was the owner of the property, which was affected by the railway project.
3. The policy of the Railway Board, as reflected in the communication dated 16th July, 2010, contemplates that the job can be offered to the son/daughter/husband/wife of the sole owner. It is claimed that the father-in-law was the sole owner and as such if the claim of the daughter-in-law is not considered, the same amounts to render bias and violation of Articles 14 and 15 of the Constitution of India. It is claimed that the petitioner has better right to claim the employment on the ground that the father-in-law's only son has expired and rest of the family members have given no objection for the same.
4. Issue notice for final disposal to the respondents, returnable on 15th April, 2025.
5. Ms. Mugdha Chandurkar, learned counsel waives notice for the respondent nos.1 and 2.

(MRS.VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)

(NITIN W.SAMBRE, J.)