



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR.**

WRIT PETITION NO. 1618 of 2026

Shirin s/o Ramesh Ankalwar

vs.

Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited (MSEDCL) through its
Managing Director and others.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's Orders
or directions and Registrar's order

Court's or Judge's Order

Mr. A.A.Mardikar, Advocate for petitioner.

CORAM :- ANIL S. KILOR and RAJ D. WAKODE, JJ.

DATE :- 23rd FEBRUARY, 2026.

P C.

Heard Shri Mardikar, the learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. The petitioner has approached this Court seeking various reliefs; more particularly, the benefit of continuity in service and consequential benefits as observed in the order of this Court dated 03.05.2024 passed in Writ Petition No. 1448 of 2023.

3. Shri Mardikar, the learned counsel for the petitioner, has invited our attention to the representation dated 09.01.2026 submitted by the petitioner to the respondent no.1. Such representation is at record page no.133-Annexure-K. The contention is that the aforesaid representation is not yet decided by the respondent no.1 and as such the petitioner's entitlement to the continuity in service and consequential benefits is not yet decided.

4. In that view of the matter, we dispose of the writ petition with a direction to the respondent no.1 to decide the representation dated 09.01.2026 submitted by the petitioner within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of this order in accordance with law. The respondent no.1 is directed to consider the order dated 03.05.2024

passed by this Court in Writ Petition No. 1448 of 2023, so also the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of *K. Samba Moorthy vs. Sanjiv Chadha and others* reported in **[2025 SCC Online SC 172]**; more particularly, para 30 of the aforesaid judgment. The decision taken thereupon shall be communicated to the petitioner within two weeks from the date of such decision.

Needless to clarify that if the decision goes adverse to the interest of the petitioner, he is at liberty to challenge such decision before this Court. The grounds raised in the writ petition are kept open.

5. With these observations and directions, the writ petition is disposed of. No order as to costs.

(RAJ D. WAKODE, J.)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)

Andurkar.