



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 10168 OF 2026

Swati Dnyandev Jagtap .. Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra
Through Its Principal Secretary And Others .. Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 9003 OF 2026**

Santosh Bhausahab Shelke And Others .. Petitioners

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra
Through Its Principal Secretary And Others .. Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 7597 OF 2026**

Pradip Sitaram Gujar And Others .. Petitioners

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra
Through Its Principal Secretary And Others .. Respondents

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 9006 OF 2026**

Archana Dinkar Jadhav .. Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra
Through Its Principal Secretary And Others .. Respondents

Mr. Rajendra S. Deshmukh, Senior Advocate a/w Mr. Vivekanand Bade, Advocate i/b Mr. Ketan D. Pote, Advocate for Petitioners.
Mr. P. K. Lakhotiya, AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 & 2.
Mr. V. D. Hon, Senior Advocate i/b Mr. Ashwin V. Hon, Advocate for Respondent No. 3.

**CORAM : KISHORE C. SANT AND
JITENDRA JAIN, JJ.**

DATE : 01st SEPTEMBER, 2026.

PER COURT :-

1. Heard the parties at length.
2. Though much arguments are advanced on the locus standi of the petitioners, the right vested with the petitioners etc. the arguments are also advanced on the communication on the part of the management. In turn, the management submits that it is the Education Officer who has not taken steps in time in spite of request by the management.
3. The issue is that for the year 2022 the respondent management had undertaken the recruitment process through Pavitra Portal. The requisition was sent to send candidates in a ratio of 1:10. The names were forwarded to the management in the said ratio. The management conducted the selection process i.e. conducted the interviews and submitted the list to the

Education Officer for further action. However, in the meantime, certain complaints were made to the management and publicity was also given through media that there are certain irregularities that have taken place in the recruitment process. In that view, looking to the reputation of the management and institution, the management passed a resolution on 06.08.2025 to cancel the recruitment process itself. They further resolved to make a request to the Education Commissionerate, Pune that instead of sending names in the ratio of 1:10, the names of candidates be send in the ratio of 1:1 so that nothing needs to be done at the end of management and such persons can be given appointment straightway.

4. The grievance of the petitioners is that in the said process they had participated. However, though the entire process is completed, even the results are not declared of the outcome of the selection process and in between the management has cancelled the process. A ground is taken of legitimate expectation that having participated in the selection process they have legitimate expectation that at least result would be made known to them. Total 1814 candidates were sent, out of only 146 candidates could

be selected as per their information and as per the inquiry conducted by the authorities. It is their grievance that still they are not given the appointment and they are not given the knowledge as to whether their names appear in the list of selected candidates or not. It is further seen that the management had also pursuant to earlier resolution thereafter again made inquiry with the Education Officer by communications dated 03.10.2025, another letter dated 03.10.2025, 21.11.2025 and 18.02.2026 for various vacancies and requested the Education Officer to give confirmation after verification of the documents.

5. This Court finds that, without going into other aspects, since all these facts are admitted we direct the Education Officer to process the request made by the management in the above communications and communicate decision to them before 07.09.2026 i.e. the date on which the candidates from subsequent recruitment process are likely to join to avoid inconvenience. With this workable arrangement this Court finds that the petitions can be disposed of. Thus, the writ petitions stand disposed of.

6. We expect the Education Officer to take decision on or before 07.09.2026.

7. This order is strictly with reference to the present petitioners who are before this Court pursuant to recruitment process of 2022 without affecting the subsequent processes and if some others have joined pursuant to subsequent process they shall not be disturbed. The decision of the Education Officer be communicated to the petitioners as well.

8. It is made clear that, this order is passed only in the peculiar facts of this case without touching to other aspects of the matter. This order shall not be treated as precedent and shall not be cited as precedent. This order is restricted to these petitioners only and will not be made applicable to other persons who are not before this Court.

9. Parties to act upon authenticated copy of this order.

(JITENDRA JAIN, J.)

(KISHORE C. SANT, J.)

P.S.B.