



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

947 WRIT PETITION NO.2630 OF 2026

Suresh Devrao Kangankar
Age: 35 years, Occu.: Computer Operator,
R/o. Apegaon, Post Akhatwade,
Tq. Shevgaon, Dist. Ahilyanagar.

.. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra
Through its Principal Secretary,
Revenue Department, Mantralaya,
Mumbai.
2. The District Collector, Ahilyanagar.
3. The Tahasildar, Shevgaon,
District Ahilyanagar.
4. The District Supply Officer, Ahilyanagar.
5. Prashant Sangade, Tahsildar, Shevgaon.
6. Smt. Mangal Pawar, Supply Officer,
Shevgaon.
7. Babasaheb Gadakh Padmakar
Age: 46 years, Occu.: Computer Operator
R/o. Rakshi, Tq. Shevgaon, Dist. Ahilyanagar.

.. Respondents

...

Mr. S. D. Madake h/f Ms. Dipali Dalve, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. S. B. Pulkundwar, AGP for Respondents/State.

...

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 11 MARCH 2026

ORDER :

. Present petition has been filed for reinstating the petitioner on the post of Data Entry Operator/Computer Operator in Tahsil Office, Shevgaon, District Ahilyanagar with all consequential service benefits, back wages and seniority.

2. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner. Learned AGP waives notice for respondent Nos.1 to 4. No necessity to issue notice to the other respondents.

3. The petitioner submits that the petitioner is continuously serving since 2016 in the Tahsil Office, Shevgaon, District Ahilyanagar in the capacity as Data Entry Operator/Computer Operator on temporary honorarium basis. On 22.12.2023, Tahsildar, Shevgaon had issued a letter appointing two persons, including the present petitioner on an urgent and temporary basis for completing the work pertaining to the Supply Department. Petitioner says that he has discharged his duties efficiently. The consolidated amount of one time remuneration of Rs.24,000/- has been paid regularly to him. The petitioner also submits that a contractual appointment letter for the post of IT Office Assistant with InfoTech International Limited was issued in favour of other staff members on 21.02.2025, however, the name of the present petitioner has

arbitrarily and deliberately excluded. In the place of petitioner, one Gadakh Babasaheb Padmakar was appointed, which the petitioner states that is arbitrary and unjust replacement. Therefore, he made several applications under the Right to Information Act to know the reason. On 24.02.2025 around 1.50 p.m. when he was performing his official duties of routine work, he was summoned by the Tahsildar and some incident took place, which the petitioner has reported under the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (hereinafter referred to as the "Atrocities Act"). According to the petitioner, one Smt. Mangal Pawar was terminated by order dated 12.08.2025, but the petitioner was not afforded any statutory rehabilitation, protection, or compensation under the provisions of the Atrocities Act. Now, he has been orally terminated. Hence, he is before this Court.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner has taken us through the documents and submits that the termination of the petitioner is arbitrary and illegal. He relies on the decision of the Hon'ble Single Bench of Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh High Court in **Feroz Ahmed Sheikh and others Vs. Union Territory of J & K through Commissioner/Secretary/Additional Chief Secretary, Industries and Commerce Department and others**, [2023 SCC OnLine J& K 1095] to show that the principles of natural justice are required to be observed in case of termination.

5. The first and the foremost fact that is required to be noted is that the petitioner has not filed any documentary evidence in the form of his appointment since 2016. The first appointment order would have given us the clue as to what is the nature of his appointment. What has been produced at Exhibit-'A' is the order by Tahsildar to his own establishment dated 22.12.2023 thereby appointing two persons for effecting the data entry in respect of Supply Department in the Computers for which amount of Rs.24,000/- be paid to each of them by cheque. Even as per the pleadings, the appointment of the petitioner was temporary and as Data Entry Operator. It appears that the services of the petitioner were taken for taking entry in the computers of the Tahsil office as required. Now, the petitioner has also not produced any documentary evidence about termination, but he says that he has been orally terminated. There is no question of reinstatement if the work that was to be carried out by the petitioner has already been completed or the task has been fulfilled. In paragraph No.6 of the petition, the petitioner refers to contractual appointment letter dated 21.02.2025 for the post of IT Office Assistant with InfoTech International Limited. Copy of this letter has also not been produced. We would insist on the wordings which have been stated in the pleadings that the said letter "...Limited was issued in favour of certain other staff members, however, the name of the present petitioner

was arbitrarily and deliberately excluded therefrom.” If the work was with the Tahsil office, then the staff members in the Tahsil office could not have been asked to work, or be appointed on a contractual basis with, a private company. Under such circumstance, it appears that even the petition has been drafted upon an incorrect information and not even by producing all the documents that is right from the first appointment in 2016. Taking into consideration the facts of this case, the decision of Hon’ble Single Bench of the Jammu and Kashmir and Ladakh High Court in **Feroz Ahmed Sheikh and others (Supra)** will not be beneficial to the petitioner. We do not find any merit in the petition. No case is made out for exercise of our powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

6. Hence, the writ petition stands dismissed.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm