

kps

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

**WRIT PETITION NO.6740 OF 2012
WITH
WRIT PETITION NO.6756 OF 2012**

Munawar Ahmed Naeem Ahmed
VERSUS
The Director Of Education (Secondary And Higher Secondary) and Ors.

WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.8474 OF 2015 IN WP/6740 OF 2012
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.8475 OF 2015 IN WP/6756 OF 2012

Abdul Gaffar Quadri
VERSUS
Munawar Ahmed Naeem Ahmed and Others.

Mr. Gaware Niteen V. , Advocate for Petitioner.

Mr. U.H.Bhogle, A.G.P. for Respondent Nos.1 to 3/State Authorities.

Mr.Gunale V.D., Advocate for Respondent No.4 in both petitions.

Mr.S.S.Kazi, Advocate for the Intervenor/ Applicant in Civil Applications.

CORAM: RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.

DATE :- 02nd September, 2015

Per Court:

1 I have heard Shri Gaware, learned Advocate appearing for the
Petitioners in both these petitions. I have also heard the learned AGP
appearing on behalf of the Respondents/ State and Shri Gunale, learned

Advocate appearing on behalf of Respondent No.4.

2 In the first petition, the Petitioner had initially assailed the order passed by Respondent No.1/ Director of Education dated 23.07.2012 in the matter in between Respondent No.4, his Employer and the Department of Education with regard to the purported bogus degree certificates having been used for securing employment.

3 By an affidavit in reply filed on behalf of Respondent No.1, it was contended that Respondent No.4/Employees in both these petitions had obtained the employment as Assistant Teachers presenting bogus certificates. It is also stated in the affidavit that Respondent No.4/Employees were responsible for preparing bogus documents and presenting the same for their benefits. Respondent No.1 then placed reliance on the document dated 17.04.2013 by which the order dated 23.07.2012 was quashed and set side and earlier orders passed by the competent authority dated 31.01.2011 and 11.06.2012 were maintained.

4 Subsequently, Respondent No.1 has passed an order dated 24.06.2013. The said order has now been assailed by amending the first petition as well as the prayer clauses. The said order dated 24.06.2013 is with regard to the cancellation of the order withdrawing approval granted

to Respondent No.4/ Employees. The second petition is also with regard to order passed in connection with Respondent No.4/Employee.

5 I called upon Shri Gaware to establish the locus of the Petitioners in relation to these proceedings. He submits that no right of the Petitioners is impinged and no legal injury is caused to them. The Petitioner is an ex-Member of the Trust and he is an ex-Employee. According to Shri Gaware, the Petitioners are apparently interested in the welfare of the Trust and concerned about loss of money/ finance caused to the public exchequer and thereby, waste of public money. He, therefore, submits that this is in the interest of the society and public.

6 In the second petition as well, neither any personal right of the Petitioner is impinged nor has the Petitioner demonstrated any legal injury.

7 Shri Gaware submits on instructions that the case put forth by the Petitioner in both these petitions is in public interest.

8 In the light of the said statement and the facts emerging from the record, both these petitions are not tenable under the writ of certiorari. The same are, therefore, dismissed.

9 All the pending Civil Applications do not survive and the same are also disposed of.

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)