



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH AT NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO.3103 OF 2025

Yogesh Kaduba Patil & Anr. Vs. Directorate of Marketing Board & Ors.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders
---	---------------------------

Mr. R.D. Karode, Advocate for the Petitioners.
 Mr. H.R. Dhumale, AGP for the Respondent Nos.1 and 2/State.
 Mr. Ashish Chaware, Advocate for Respondent No.3.
 Mr. Harish Dangre, Advocate for Respondent Nos.4 to 14, 16 and 17.

CORAM: PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.

DATED : 03rd FEBRUARY, 2026

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned counsel for the respondents.
2. The controversy involved in the petition is with respect to the extension of service of the respondent No.3 as Secretary of the Agricultural Produce Market Committee (APMC), Malkapur beyond the age of superannuation i.e. 60 years.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although Rule 13 of the APMC Service Rules provided that no employee could be permitted to be in employment beyond the age of 60 years, the respondent No.3 was likely to be granted extension beyond the age of 60 years and hence, the petition was filed challenging the Order dated 02.06.2025 passed by the Director of Marketing Board, Maharashtra State, Pune.
4. Learned counsel for the respondent No.3 has tendered across the bar a Resolution dated 17.12.2025

passed by the APMC, Malkapur, by which it is resolved that further extension of six months to the respondent No.3 after completion of 60 years may not be granted. A copy of Resolution dated 17.12.2025 is taken on record and marked as "X" for identification purpose only.

5. Learned AGP has also placed on record a communication dated 22.01.2026 issued by the Directorate of Marketing Board, Maharashtra State, Pune addressed to the APMC, Malkapur thereby, conveying that on account of breach of condition of extension by letter dated 02.06.2025, the further proposal for extension beyond 60 years is rejected. A copy of letter dated 22.01.2026 is taken on record and marked as "Y" for identification purpose only.

6. In view of these developments, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the grievance raised by petitioner in the instant petition does not survive. The contentions on merits are not dealt with and are kept open.

7. The parties are at liberty to raise appropriate grievance, if situation arises. Accordingly, writ petition is disposed of.

(PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.)

Privel