



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

WRIT PETITION NO.1849/2026

Chandrakant Kisanrao Shirsat and another

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra, through its Chief Secretary, Ministry Skill Development, Employment, Entrepreneurship Department, Mumbai and others

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

Court's or Judge's orders

Shri S.S. Bhalerao, Advocate for petitioners
Shri N.S. Rao, AGP for respondent Nos.1 to 4/State

CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR AND RAJ D. WAKODE, JJ.

DATE : 04.03.2026

1. Heard learned Counsel for petitioners.
2. The petitioners are retired employees of respondent No. 4 – Assistant Commissioner, Ministry of Skill Development and Employment, Entrepreneurship, Udyog Bhawan, Yavatmal. The contention of the petitioner Nos.1 and 2 is that they were appointed on 17.11.1979 and 03.12.1981, respectively, with respondent No. 4. The petitioners served the respondents without any blemish until their superannuation.
3. On 29.10.1990, the Government of Maharashtra had adopted a policy whereby those employees had done excellent work have been granted one additional increment along with yearly increment. The petitioners were eligible for such increment. Accordingly, on 22.07.2008, respondent

No. 2 issued an order granting the benefit of advance additional increment to the petitioners with effect from 01.07.2007.

4. However, even after the passage of almost 16 years, the said benefit has not been granted to the petitioners. It is a matter of record that respondent No. 3, on 10.12.2025, forwarded a proposal to the office of respondent No. 1 for taking an appropriate decision in the aforesaid regard.

5. Respondent No. 3 also brought to the notice of respondent No. 1 the decisions of this Court and of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, and specifically opined that the office of respondent No. 3 has no objection to granting the benefits to the petitioners. The aforesaid proposal dated 10.12.2025 is placed on record at page No. 52 (Annexure-K).

6. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that, despite the passage of more than 18 years and the decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and this Court in cases of similarly situated employees, and despite there being no objection from respondent No. 3 in its proposal dated 10.12.2025, respondent No. 1 has not taken any decision in the matter granting the aforesaid benefits to the petitioners.

7. In view of the above, we dispose of the present Writ Petition with a direction to respondent No. 1 to decide the aforesaid proposal dated 10.12.2025 submitted by

respondent No. 3, in respect of the present petitioners, within a stipulated period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the order of this Court.

8. The petitioners undertake to produce a copy of the order of this Court, as well as the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and this Court in cases of similarly situated employees, before respondent No. 1 within a period of one week from today. The decision taken thereupon shall be communicated to the petitioners within a period of two weeks from the date of the decision.

9. The Writ Petition is disposed of.

(RAJ D. WAKODE, J.)

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)