

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

BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 443 OF 2015

SATISH DNYANESHWAR GHODKE

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRAAD OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Panpatte V. S.

AGP for Respondents-State: Mr. D. B. Bhange

Advocate for Respondent No.2 : Mr. Dilip N. Patil Bankar

...

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &  
V. L. ACHLIYA , JJ.****DATE : 13th February, 2015****PER COURT :**

1. Mr. Panpatte, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was appointed pursuant to the advertisement as Shikshan Sevak. On 06.07.2013, the proposal was forwarded by the employer to the Education Officer seeking approval to the appointment of the petitioner. However, even after one and half year, no decision is taken on the said proposal. Three surplus candidates are also accommodated by respondent No.3.

2. Mr. Bankar Patil, the learned counsel for respondent No.2 submits that if the proposal is pending, the same shall be decided on its own merits, expeditiously. In the light of that, we pass following order:

1. The respondent No.2 shall decide the proposal submitted by respondent No.3 in respect of the petitioner seeking approval to his appointment expeditiously, in accordance with law and policy, preferably within three months.
2. Writ petition disposed of. No costs.

**(V. L. ACHLIYA, J.)****( S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J. )**

JPC