Ajit

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 11103 OF 2026

Prakash Balasaheb Patil ...Petitioner
Versus
Chief Personal Officer, Konkan Railway Corporation Ltd. And Anr ...Respondents

---

Mr Ashok T. Gade a/w Ms Riya John & Mr Navin B. Rathod, for the Petitioner.

Mr Rohit Sakhadeo, for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

AJIT RAMESH PATHRIKAR
Digitally signed by AJIT RAMESH PATHRIKAR
Date: 2026.10.14 17:59:01 +0530

CORAM: G. S. KULKARNI &
DR. NEELA GOKHALE, JJ.

DATE: 12th OCTOBER 2026

P.C.

1. By this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the Petitioner seeks to direct the Respondents to decide his representation dated 17th February 2026 seeking to regularise his services as Assistant Engineer (Regular). By the parties' consent, the petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage.

2. The Petitioner joined Konkan Railway Corporation Limited ('KRCL') as a Foreman on 23rd April 1991 and was promoted to Junior Engineer with effect from 13th July 1998. On 19th May 2016, he was selected on an ad hoc basis as Assistant Engineer ('AEN') for the Udhampur–Srinagar–Baramulla Rail Link ('USBRL') project in Jammu and Kashmir, where he worked until the project was completed in 2025. He requested regularisation as AEN, but a communication dated 4th June

2021 rejected it, stating it was outside the policy's ambit. By Office Order No. 85/23 dated 29th March 2023, he was promoted to Senior Section Engineer. On completion of the project, by order dated 21st March 2025, he was posted as SSE/PWAY/PDMC, Belapur, Navi Mumbai.

3. The Petitioner contends that the order dated 21st March 2025 is, in effect, a reversion and that, having worked as an AEN for nearly a decade, he deserves to be regularised in that post. He issued a legal notice dated 20th September 2025 seeking withdrawal of the order dated 21st March 2025, and thereafter submitted a representation dated 17th February 2026 seeking regularisation as an AEN. His grievance is that the matter remains undecided to date.

4. Heard learned counsel for the respective parties and perused the record with their assistance.

5. The representation made by the Petitioner as well as the legal notice have remained unanswered for over a year; KRCL is expected to consider and decide the grievance within a reasonable time. The Petitioner, aged 56, cannot be left without a decision.

6. The petition is accordingly allowed in the following terms:

(a) Respondent No. 1 shall consider and decide the Petitioner's representation dated 17 February 2026, together with the legal notice dated 20 September 2025, in accordance with law and the applicable rules and policies of KRCL, after giving the Petitioner an opportunity to be heard, within four weeks from today.

(b) The decision shall be communicated to the Petitioner within one week of the decision.

(c) All contentions of all the parties in that regard are expressly kept open.

7. Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

(DR. NEELA GOKHALE, J) (G. S. KULKARNI, J.)