

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR.**

**L.P.A.No.192 of 2013**  
**in**  
**Writ Petition No.578 of 2009**  
**(Murlidhar Sadashiv Jumale .vs. Dnyandeep Employees Education Welfare**  
**and Multipurpose Society, Amravati and ors. )**  
**with**  
**L.P.A.No.193 of 2013**  
**in**  
**Writ Petition No.574 of 2009**  
**(Devendra Shripatrao Parvatkar .vs. Dnyandeep Employees Education**  
**Welfare and Multipurpose Society, Amravati and ors. )**  
**with**  
**L.P.A.No.194 of 2013**  
**in**  
**Writ Petition No.579 of 2009**  
**(Prabhakar Ramrao Dhurandhar .vs. Dnyandeep Employees Education**  
**Welfare and Multipurpose Society, Amravati and ors. )**  
**with**

-----  
Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,  
appearances, Court's orders or directions  
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders.

---

Mr. V.A. Kothale, Advocate for Appellants in all appeals.  
Mr. A.S. Kilor, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 1 & 3 in all appeals.  
Mrs. K.S. Joshi, AGP for Respondent No.4 in all appeals.

**CORAM : B.R. Gavai & Prasanna B. Varale, JJ.**  
**DATED : October 16, 2015.**

The appeals challenge the concurrent orders passed by the learned School Tribunal so also the learned Single Judge thereby dismissing the appeals of the present appellants and the writ petitions filed by the present appellants challenging the order of the learned School Tribunal.

The learned School Tribunal so also the learned Single Judge have come to a finding that the present appellants have not placed any material on record to show that they are appointed by following the

due procedure as prescribed by the law even by the earlier Management. Today also nothing is placed on record to show that either the services of the appellants were approved by the competent Education Officer or they were appointed by following the due procedure as prescribed by the law.

In that view of the matter, no perversity or illegality can be said to have been committed by the learned School Tribunal as well as the learned Single Judge. Letters Patent Appeal Nos. 192 of 2013, 193 of 2013 and 194 of 2013 are rejected.

**JUDGE**

**JUDGE**