

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**13 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6245 OF 2021  
IN WP/1084/2011 WITH WP/1084/2011  
WITH CA/6943/2016 IN WP/1084/2011**

RAMAKANT SUDHAKAR THAKUR  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Anil S. Golegaonkar  
AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 to 5 : Mr. S.R. Yadav  
Advocate for Respondents No. 6: Mr. V.B. Jadhav h/f  
Mr. V. D. Hon, Senior Advocate

...

**WITH**  
**13 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 6246 OF 2021  
IN WP/1085/2011 WITH WP/1085/2011  
WITH CA/10046/2016 IN WP/1085/2011**

SANJAY PRABHAKAR THAKUR  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Anil S. Golegaonkar  
AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 to 5 : Mr. S.R. Yadav  
Advocate for Respondents No. 6: Mr. V.B. Jadhav h/f  
Mr. V. D. Hon, Senior Advocate

...

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE AND  
S. G. DIGE, JJ.**

**DATE : 4<sup>th</sup> APRIL, 2022**

**PER COURT :-**

1. We have perused the order passed by this Court on 14-01-2022.
2. The learned AGP points out a communication received by respondent No. 5 from respondent No. 6, which indicates that, on 14-01-2022 when this Court passed an order, the petitioners had

received their entire salary till November, 2021 and it was only the salary for the month of December, 2021, payable in January, 2022 that was pending.

3. We make it clear that the observations made by this Court in paragraph No. 2 of the order dated 14-01-2022 was in the light of the statement made by the petitioners that the order dated 13-08-2021 passed by this Court is not complied with by the respondents. Factually, it was complied with, except the December's Salary payable in January, 2022. The petitioners apparently have made incorrect statement before us that their salary is withheld.

4. Considering the request made by the applicants in the civil applications, the same are disposed off with the direction that writ petition Nos. 1084 of 2011 and 1085 of 2011 shall be listed for final hearing on 9<sup>th</sup> June, 2022.

5. The petitioners shall not seek an adjournment.

6. Needless to state, this Court would also consider the submissions of the petitioners in the light of the judgment delivered by the Apex Court in the matter of *Chairman and Managing Director, Food Corporation of India and others Versus Jagdish Balaram Bahira and others (2017) 8 SCC 670* .

7. Consequently, Civil Application Nos. 6943 of 2016 and 10046 of 2016, do not survive and stand disposed off.

( S.G. DIGE )  
JUDGE

( RAVINDRA V. GHUGE )  
JUDGE