



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 5454 OF 2026

WITH

RAST/13831/2026

PANDURANG NARAYAN PATIL

VERSUS

**THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THR THE SECRETARY AND
OTHERS**

...

Advocate for Applicant / Petitioner :

Ms. Sharayu K. Dhanture h/f. Mr. Gore Ravindra Vitthal

AGP for Respondent/State: Mr. J. P. Reddy

Advocate for Non-applicant / Respondent No.4 :

Mr. N. E. Deshmukh

...

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 5455 OF 2026

IN

RAST/13831/2026

...

**CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER &
VAISHALI PATIL-JADHAV, JJ.**

DATE : 08.05.2026

PER COURT:

1. Heard.

2. The present Review Application is filed along with application for condonation of delay of 44 days. The learned counsel for the non-applicant / respondent has no objection for the condonation of delay. Accordingly, the civil application for condonation of delay is allowed.

3. **Ms. Sharayu K. Dhanture** holding for **Mr. Gore Ravindra Vitthal**, learned counsel for the Applicant has invited our attention at Paragraph No.4 of the order dated 20.02.2026 under review, wherein she made a statement that the the Applicant Pandurang Narayan Patil / Petitioner in Writ Petition No.3110 of 2019 has superannuated. In the present Review Application, she submits that the Applicant / Petitioner – Pandurang Narayan Patil is not superannuated and still working and the case of the Applicant / Petitioner – Pandurang Narayan Patil would be identically placed as the other petitioners in connected Writ Petition No.1964 of 2018, Writ Petition No.1957 of 2018 and 2042 of 2018. She submits that her statement may be permitted to be recalled and the relief granted to the other Petitioners may also be granted to the Applicant / Petitioner – Pandurang Narayan Patil in Writ Petition No.3110 of 2019.

She is permitted to recall the statement. The statement made in Paragraph No.4 of the order dated 20.02.2026 in Writ Petition No.3110 of 2019 as noted above is recalled.

4. However, **Mr. N. E. Deshmukh**, the learned counsel appearing for Respondent No.4 submits that the Applicant / Petitioner – Pandurang Narayan Patil is not identically placed as similar to the other Petitioners in connected writ petitions. He

submits that his age was 45 years in the year 2014, whereas the other Petitioners became age barred somewhere in the year 2017-2018. The Division Bench of this court in Writ Petition No.8289 of 2019, by Judgment and Order dated 10.11.2025, has observed that after 2015 till 2018 no steps whatsoever were taken for making recruitment from the 10% quota of the employees of Village Panchayat as a result of which the petitioners have crossed the age of 45 years and they have been deprived from being absorbed in the employment of Respondent No.3 - Zilla Parishad for no fault on their part.

5. Considering the above factual situation the other Petitioners were not at fault, this court permitted the Petitioners to include their names in the seniority list and to give appointments as per the seniority list.

6. However, the Petitioner / Review Applicant became time barred on having attained the age of 45 years in the year 2014. The Zilla Parishad contends that 10% quota of employees of village Panchayat were filled in prior to 2015 and the Petitioner was not absorbed as he was not falling within the 10%. He further submits that the Petitioner's contention in the Writ Petition has been that the juniors are appointed.

7. In any event, the case of Review Applicant is not identical to the connected Writ Petitions. He thus submits that no relief can be granted to the Petitioner on the similar lines.

8. The learned counsel for the Applicant / Petitioner has not been able to dispute this factual aspect that the Applicant / Petitioner was age 45 years in 2014 and that the Zilla Parishad has specifically contended before this court that they have to take in 10% reserved quota.

9. The Petitioner cannot be granted similar benefits as granted to the Petitioners in connected Writ Petitions. Thus, no case is made out for interference.

10. The Review Application stands dismissed.

11. In view of dismissal of the Review Application. Pending Civil Application is also disposed of.

[VAISHALI PATIL-JADHAV, J.]

[ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.]

marathe