

ITEM NO.19

COURT NO.13

SECTION IX

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 15404/2016  
(Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 07/04/2016  
in WP No. 496/2016 passed by the High Court Of Bombay At Nagpur)

DR. SHIVAJI VYANKATESH BHOSLE

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

MAHARASHTRA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION, MUMBAI AND ORS.Respondent(s)  
(With appln. (s) for exemption from filing O.T.)

Date : 29/07/2016 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVA KIRTI SINGH  
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE R. BANUMATHI

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Atul Babasaheb Dakh,Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Guru Krishna Kumar,Sr.Adv.  
Mr. Satyajit Desai,Adv.  
Mr. Akash Kakade,Adv.  
Ms. Anagha S. Desai,Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Guru Krishna Kumar, learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of Respondent NO. 2 who is the main contesting respondent, being the successful sole petitioner before the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal.

In view of the appearance of the main contesting respondent and also in view of the submissions advanced before us, it is not necessary to keep this matter pending.

On going through the impugned order by which the High Court of Judicature at Bombay has kept the Writ

Petition No. 496/2016 pending but has vacated the interim order of status quo passed by it on 1<sup>st</sup> February, 2016, we find that the High Court has assigned no reasons at all, not even in one sentence, as to why the earlier order has been vacated when the writ petition is still pending. We were inclined to interfere with the said order but learned counsel for Respondent NO. 2 submits that in the meantime appointment letter dated 18<sup>th</sup> April, 2016 has been issued in favour of this Respondent who has joined on 22<sup>nd</sup> April, 2016.

In view of such development brought to our notice, we refrain from interfering with the matter by ordering status quo. But this is because Respondent No.2 has agreed that the writ petition itself may be heard and decided expeditiously preferably within a period of two months. With that concession in mind, we dispose of the special leave petition by observing that the developments such as appointment and joining as noted shall be subject to the final result of the writ petition pending before the High Court. Further, the writ petition itself be decided expeditiously preferably within a period of two months. We have not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case between the parties.

(Madhu Bala)  
Court Master

(Madhu Narula)  
Court Master