



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 2200 OF 2025

Makrand s/o Manoharrao Linge,
Aged about 52 years,
Occupation : Service,
R/o. Flat No. 203, Sumitra Apartment
Near Govind Swamy Mandir,
Samadhi Ward, Chandrapur,
Tah. and District-Chandrapur

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. Zilla Parishad, Chandrapur,
Through its Chief Officer
2. Deputy Chief Officer (General),
Zilla Parishad, Chandrapur
3. Deputy Chief Officer
(Village Panchayat),
Zilla Parishad, Chandrapur

...RESPONDENTS

Shri A.S. Dhore, Advocate for petitioners
Shri B.P. Maldhure, Advocate for respondent No.1

**CORAM : SMT. M.S. JAWALKAR AND
NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, JJ.**
DATE : 11.02.2026

ORAL JUDGMENT (PER : NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, JJ.)

Heard.

2. **Rule.** Rule is made returnable forthwith. Heard finally by the consent of the parties.

3. The petition is praying for a direction that the petitioner is entitled for seniority from the date of his initial appointment i.e. 15.06.1999 on the post of Gramsevak under the services of the respondent, Zilla Parishad and accordingly for granting benefits of promotion considering the seniority from the said date.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the Post Recruitment Examination Rules, 1985, Zilla Parishad employees required to pass the Post Recruitment Examination within four years of the initial appointment. According to him the petitioner has passed the said examination in 2002, however, the results of the same were published on February, 2003. It is further stated that even though a specific objection regarding the same and for granting the benefits as per the result declared, it is still pending with the respondent No.1 since March, 2025. Learned Counsel for the petitioner has pointed out that an identical controversy has been dealt with by this Court in Writ Petition No.4111/2018 (Sushil Chokhaji Bambole and another Vs. State of Maharashtra and ors.

and vide its judgment dated 21.02.2024, Co-ordinate Bench of this Court has quashed the impugned order therein. Learned Counsel for the petitioner also invites our attention the order dated 23.04.2025, in the present matter, wherein a direction was issued to consider the claim of the petitioner in light of the judgment referred supra. It is submission of the learned Counsel for the petitioner that in spite of the authoritative pronouncements of this Court in the earlier matter and a direction of this Court in the present matter, the same has not been decided.

5. Shri Maldhure, learned Counsel for the respondent accedes to this position and states that representation/objection dated 03.03.2025, has not been decided as yet.

6. Even though we may not comment on the apathy on the respondent for not deciding the objection for over eleven months. No plausible explanation is coming forward in the reply filed by the respondent for the same. Be that as it may, we dispose of the petition with a direction to the respondent No.2 to decide the objection/representation made by the petitioner on 03.03.2025 which is still pending with them. With these directions the writ

petition is disposed off. The representation dated 03.03.2025 is to be decided as expeditiously as possible and in any case within three weeks from the date of receipt of the order.

7. The petitioner to appear before the said authority i.e. the respondent No.1 on 16.02.2026 and to appraise the authority of the order of this Court.

8. The writ petition is disposed of.

9. Rule accordingly. No order as to costs.

(NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, J.)

(SMT. M.S. JAWALKAR, J.)

Jayashree..