



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

CIVIL APPLICATION (CAW) NO. 370 OF 2025
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 588 OF 2025

Dr. Bhuwneshwari w/o. Ashok Mehre **Vs.** Parampujya Dr. Babasaheb Ambedkar Smarak
Samiti, Diksha Bhumi, Nagpur & Ors.

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

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. Mohan Sudame, Sr. Advocate a/b. Mr. P.B. Patil, Advocate for the
petitioner.

Mr. Gopal Sharma, Advocate h/f. Mr. S.D. Abhyankar, Advocate for
respondent no.1.

Mr. R.D. Bhuihar, Advocate for respondent no.2.

Mr. I.J. Damle, Assistant Government Pleader for respondent no.3.

Mr. M.P. Kariya, Advocate for the applicant in CAW No.370/2025.

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE AND MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, JJ.

DATE : 4th MARCH, 2025.

P.C.

1. The applicant claims to be the complainant
whose complaint led to the passing of the impugned order
in this petition.

2. It is the case of the applicant that she be
permitted to intervene as she has brought to the notice of
respondent no.1-Management about the illegality
committed by the petitioner and as such she has every
right and locus in the matter.

3. The prayer is opposed by the counsel for the

petitioner.

4. We have considered the claim put-forth in the application.

5. It is not the case of the applicant that she is one of the candidates, who is claiming the appointment to the post of Principal.

6. Once the applicant claims that she has lodged a complaint against the original petitioner to the Management, her role in the matter comes to an end as it is the Management who has passed the order impugned. If the petition is allowed or dismissed, same will not have any adverse consequence on the civil rights of the applicant.

7. That being so, the application stands rejected.

8. In response to the Court's query, it is informed that since the College Tribunal is not functioning, the petitioner has no other remedy but to approach this Court. In response to the Court's query, it is claimed that, if so required, the petitioner shall be filing an appeal against the impugned order.

CIVIL APPLICATION (CAW) NO. 445 OF 2025

9. Learned counsel Mr. Gopal Sharma holding for Mr. S.D. Abhyankar submits that the amendment be not allowed as it is open for the petitioner to pursue the same

in an independent proceedings.

10. Since the amendment is based on subsequent development, the prayer for amendment stands allowed.

11. The amendment be carried out within a period of one week.

12. Within two weeks thereafter, reply be placed on record.

13. Stand over to 03.04.2025.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)

Vijay