

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

LD-VC-CW- 204 -2020

Nalini Naik

.... Petitioner

V e r s u s

**The Director,
Directorate of Education and anr.**

..... Respondents

Adv. C. Padgaonkar for the Petitioner.

Ms. Sulekha Kamat, Addl. Government Advocate for the Respondent no.1.

CORAM: DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.**DATE: 21st October, 2020.****ORDER:**

This matter concerns the compulsory retirement of the petitioner, as a penalty for her alleged misconduct in service. That order has been implemented, as confirmed by the Administrative Tribunal. Therefore, the petitioner is before this Court, invoking its extraordinary jurisdiction.

2. At any rate, the learned counsel for the petitioner points out that compulsory retirement is non- stigmatic, as if the employee had been allowed to superannuate or retire in the due course. Therefore, in the last two years, the employer must have settled the petitioner's terminal retirement benefits. The learned counsel, nevertheless, stresses, that arrangement must be without prejudice to the petitioner's contentions in this Writ petition.

3. The learned counsel for the respondent no.2, however, seeks time to

get instructions on this count.

4. Post the matter on 24/11/2020.
5. In the meanwhile, either party to the proceedings may file on record any additional material which has already been part of the record before the Tribunal.

DAMA SESHADRI NAIDU, J.

AP/-