

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 1530 OF 2013

**EKLAVYA MAGAS SEVA SAMITI, MANKHED
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA**

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr N. P Patil Jamalpurkar
AGP for Respondents: Mr. K G Patil
Advocate for Respondents : Mr. V.D. Sapkal

**WITH
WP/1557/2013**

**SHRIRAM SHIKSHAN PRASARAK MANDAL SINDHALA (L)
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA.**

...

Mr. N.P.Patil Jamalpurkar Advocate for petitione
Mr. K.G.Patil AGP for Respondent State.

...

**WITH
WP/1729/2013**

**NAVJIVAN SHIKSHAN PRASARAK MANDAL AMBA TANDA TQ.
KANNAD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA.**

...

Mr. Sanjaykumar Chavan advocate for petitioner
Mr. K.G.Patil AGP for Respondents.

...

**WITH
WP/1749/2013**

**MARATHWADA BAJNARA SEVA SANGH (MANDAL) NAIKNAGAR,
AURANGABAD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA**

...

Mr. B.N.Patil advocate for petitioner.
Mr. K.G.Patil AGP for Respondent State.

...

WITH

WP/1855/2013

MATOSHREE TULSI SHIKSHAN PRASARAK MANDAL, SILLOD
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA.

...

Mr. V.D Sapkal advocate for petitioner.
Mr. K G Patil AGP for Respondent State.

...

WITH**WP/2915/2013**

PUNAYSHLOK AHILYADEVI JIVAN VIKAS MAHILA MANDAL
AHMEDPUR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA.

...

Mr. S.G.Rudrawar advocate for Petitioner
Mr. K.G.Patil AGP for Respondent State.

...

WITH**WP/3040/2013**

AHILYABAI HOLKAR SHIKSHAN PRASARAK MANDAL
KAREPUR TQ. RENAPUR DIST LATUR.
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS.

...

CORAM : A.V. NIRGUDE & V.K. JADHAV, JJ.**Dated: August 21, 2015**

...

PER COURT :-

1. These petitions challenge suspension of Government Resolution dated 21.01.2013 and Corrigendum dated 24.01.2013. Admittedly, these Government Resolutions promised substantial financial help to petitioners and similarly placed societies who manage petitioners Colleges for V.J.N.T alongwith Ashramshala. Unfortunately, on 8.2.2013, the State of Maharashtra suspended the implementation of this resolution alongwith Corrigendum. Reason for this is given that, it would cause burden on Government exchequer and that Finance Department's

concurrence was not obtained. Since, suspension occurred within two weeks, petitioners and similarly placed societies would not face substantial loss and prejudice. Nonetheless, promised help should come to the concerned after obtaining concurrence of Finance Department. Incident is of 2013. We are now in 2015. We expect the Government of Maharashtra to take decision on the fate of Resolution dated 21.1.2013 alongwith Corrigendum as early as possible and we direct them to do so within ONE YEAR from today.

2. Writ Petitions accordingly disposed of. No costs.

(V.K. JADHAV, J.)

(A V NIRGUDE, J.)

aaa/-