



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.7817 OF 2018

Ambadas Mahadev Khade] ... Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Anr.] ... Respondents

...

Ms. Gunjan Shah i/b Mr. Kayval P. Shah for the petitioner.

Mr. Navraj Jalota with Anoop Sharma i/b G.K. Tripathi for respondent No.2.

Mr. P.P. Pujari, A.G.P. for the respondent-State.

...

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.

DATED : 26TH FEBRUARY, 2022.

P.C.:-

1. By Judgment dated 24/02/2022, this petition has been partly allowed. The judgment was dictated in open court for almost 1½ hours. I have noted in the order as regards the continuous absence of the learned advocate for respondent No.2.

2. After signing the order on 25/02/2022 and just before it could be uploaded, the Court Sheristedar, Ms. Sawant, came to my



chamber in lunch recess and pointed out a note, which is dated 25/02/2022 filed by advocate Ghanshyam Tripathi, stating therein, that though the matter has been disposed off, he seeks urgent circulation. There is neither an application nor a review petition filed. However, in the interest of justice, I accepted the circulation note and posted the decided matter today.

3. The learned advocate for respondent No.2 submits that he could not work out the matter due to personal difficulty. I showed him the order which is already signed. He, therefore, stated that he will read the judgment in the court hall, have a conference with the client and then decide, what is to be done.

4. The learned counsel, after going through the order, submits that the order may be stayed for six weeks. The learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been out of employment since 24/01/2013 and the petitioner has also been punished for the minor misconduct, by depriving him of the back wages to the extent of 25%.

5. In view of the above, the request of the management is rejected.

[RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.]