



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 3410 OF 2026

Ankush Shankarrao Pawar
Age @36 yrs, Oce Service.
R/o. Arjun Nagar, Amravati,
Tq. & Dist. Amravati

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

- 1) The Divisional Commissioner,
Amravati division, Amravati.
- 2) The Additional Commissioner,
(Establishment),
Divisional Commissioner Offices Amravati
Division, Amravati
- 3) The Zilla Parishad. Amravati
Through its Chief Executive Officer
Amravati Division, Amravati

...RESPONDENTS

Shri S.M. Vaishnav, Advocate for petitioner
Shri B.N. Jaipurkar, Advocate for respondent
Ms D.I. Charlewar, AGP for respondent/State

CORAM : **SMT. M.S. JAWALKAR AND**
NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, JJ.
DATE : **24.04.2026**

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

Heard.

2. Issue notice to the respondents.

3. The learned Assistant Government Pleader waives notice for respondent Nos. 1 and 2/State.

4. Shri B.N. Jaipurkar, learned Counsel waives notice for respondent No.3.

5. **Rule.** Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally with the consent of the parties.

6. In view of the order we are passing in the present matter, the reply of the respondents is being dispensed with.

7. As can be seen from the averments made in the petition that the petitioner came to be appointed on the post of Parichar (Attendant) in Zilla Parishad, Yavatmal, on 21.07.2012. As per condition No. 14 of the said order it was clarified that as the petitioner is possessing necessary qualification for appointment on Class 3 post, but due to non availability of such post, he is appointed on Class 4 post, and would be considered for appointment on Class 3 post as and when available. Thereafter, on 25.07.2016, he was promoted to the post of Senior Clerk in Class 3 category.

8. Then the petitioner was transferred to Zilla Parishad Amravati from Zilla Parishad Yavatmal, by way of an inter- district transfer. On 21.11.2025, the petitioner preferred a representation to respondent No.2, thereby claiming the deemed date and other benefits. However, the said representation/appeal was returned vide said communication of the even date, thereby observing that the petitioner must approach the authority through a proper channel. As can be seen from the averments in the petition that on 17.12.2025, the respondent No.3 has forwarded an appeal/representation of the petitioner to the respondent No. 2 for consideration of the first respondent.

9. It is the contention of the petitioner that, however, till date the said appeal is pending, and therefore the petitioner has approached this Court seeking a direction to respondent Nos. 1 and 2 to decide the appeal/representation filed by him received from respondent No. 3 by way of a letter dated 17.12.2025 in a time-bound manner.

10. We have heard Shri Vaishnav, learned Counsel for the petitioner, as also the learned Assistant Government Pleader for

respondent Nos. 1 and 2/State and Shri B.N. Jaipurkar, learned Counsel for the respondent No.3.

11. In view of the innocuous prayer being made in the petition and in view of the admitted facts as can be borne out from the documents of the record, we dispose of the petition by directing the respondent Nos. 1 and 2 to decide the said appeal/representation filed by the petitioner received from the respondent No.3 by way of a letter dated 17.12.2025 as expeditiously as possible and in any case within four days from the date of this order. To avoid any ambiguity, the petitioner is directed to appear before respondent No. 1 on 30.04.2026.

12. Needless to mention that the respondent No.1 will decide the appeal/representation in accordance with law, and after granting an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and all other concerned parties.

13. The petition is allowed and disposed of. Rule is made absolute in the above terms.

(NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, J.)

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