IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO. 153 OF 2019
IN WP/4119/2016

Dr. Preeti Deepak Desai .. Applicant

Versus

Shri Saibaba Sansthan Trust, Shirdi
Through its Executive Officer And Another .. Respondents

Mr. Ajinkya Kale, Advocate h/f Talekar & Associates for Applicant.
Mr. Nitin Bhavar Patil, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 1 & 2.

CORAM : KISHORE C. SANT AND
JITENDRA JAIN, JJ.

DATE : 06th OCTOBER, 2026.

PER COURT :-

1. Heard learned advocate for the applicant and learned advocate for respondents.

2. By way of this application, the applicant has sought quashment of the judgment and order dated 30.11.2017 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No. 4119/2016. This Court by order dated 12.04.2019 has passed an order treating the petition as review application as the order passed by this Court is sought to be recalled. It is thus the writ petition is treated as review application. In the writ petition challenge was to the termination

order dated 10.03.2016. An order states that the petitioner was appointed on a probation period for one year by order dated 17.03.2015. As the said period was coming to an end on 16.03.2016 the services of the petitioner are being terminated from that date. The said order was challenged. This Court by the order which is sought to be reviewed held that no case was made out calling for interference in the order. It was recorded that the ad-hoc committee which is managing the affairs has passed a resolution to terminate the services of the petitioner as her services are found to be unsatisfactory. It is further observed that, since the petitioner was only on probation period, no inquiry was necessary. It was observed that the committee by resolution had taken a decision to terminate the services of the petitioner and authorized the Chief Executive Officer to issue an order of termination. This Court thus found that no case was made out in the writ petition. It is the case of the applicant/petitioner that the termination order was passed under the signature of the Chief Executive Officer of the Sansthan who was not authorized to pass such an order. So far as this aspect is concerned, this Court observed that, it was the committee's decision to terminate the petitioner which was signed by the Chief Executive Officer as he

was authorized to communicate the order.

3. In the petition respondent/Sansthan filed an affidavit in reply and has produced on record the copy of resolution of the committee. It is now contended by the applicant that no such meeting was ever held and as such there was no resolution passed to terminate the services and this vital aspect needs to be considered. The learned advocate Mr. Bhavar for respondents argued that because this material was found after the applicant applied under Right to Information Act. The review is maintainable as the said document requires consideration.

4. This Court has seen the impugned order. Nothing is brought to the notice of this Court making out a case to review an order. The applicant was simply appointed on probation for a period of one year. It is only a communication that since her services were coming to an end on 16.03.2016 and since her work is found to be unsatisfactory, her services are no more required. This Court does not find that the order is stigmatic or merely because it was passed or communicated on the basis of some resolution, it can be challenged on that ground.

5. For all these reasons this Court is convinced that there is no case made out to review the order. The review application thus stands disposed of.

(JITENDRA JAIN, J.) **(KISHORE C. SANT, J.)**

P.S.B.