

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

**WRIT PETITION NO.3354 OF 2016**

Ram Hemla Chavan,  
Age 48 years, Occ. Service as  
Superintendent, r/o. Primary  
Ashram School, Krushnawadi,  
Tq. Mudkhed, Dist. Nanded  
and 18 others ..Petitioners

versus

The State of Maharashtra  
and ors. ..Respondents

--

Mr.A.V.Indrale Patil, Advocate for petitioners

Mr.S.K.Kadam, AGP for respondent nos.1 to 4 –  
State

Mr.S.P.Dhobale, Advocate for respondent nos.5 to 7

--

**AND**

**WRIT PETITION NO.841 OF 2016**

Bhaurao Wajir Aade,  
Age 43 years, Occ. Service  
as Junior Clerk, r/o.  
c/o. Madhyamik  
Ashram School, Mudkhed,  
Tq. Mudkhed, Dist.Nanded  
and 11 others ..Petitioners

versus

The State of Maharashtra  
and ors. ..Respondents

--

Mr.A.V.Indrale Patil, Advocate for petitioners

Mr.S.K.Kadam, AGP for respondent nos.1 to 4 –  
State

--

**CORAM : S.S. SHINDE AND  
SANGITRAO S. PATIL, JJ.**  
**DATE : JUNE 14, 2016**

**PER COURT :**

Heard.

2. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. With the consent of the learned counsel appearing for the parties, the petition is taken up for final hearing at admission stage.

3. The petitioners are the employees of private aided Ashram Schools. The petitioners are claiming their entitlement to higher pay scale under Assured Career Progress Scheme (for short '**the ACPS**') on completion of 12 years of qualifying service from the respective dates of their initial appointments.

4. It is the contention of the petitioners that the employees serving in private aided Ashram Schools are discriminated and have been denied benefits under the ACPS, whereas the said benefits are made available to the Ashram Schools conducted by the Social Welfare Department, and other private aided schools conducted by other Departments.

5. The issue raised in the petition is no more *res-integra* in view of the judgment of the Division Bench delivered at the Principal Seat of the Bombay High Court in Writ Petition No.2358/2013 and other companion matters decided on 21<sup>st</sup> September, 2013. The Division Bench in paragraph nos. 17 to 19 of the order has observed thus:-

"17. The Assured Career Progress Scheme is a welfare scheme which is basically brought about to remove stagnation as very few promotion avenues are available to Group `C"

and 'D' employees. The ACPS enables the eligible employees to be placed in higher pay scale. The eligible non-teaching staff of the aided Secondary Schools in Group 'C' and 'D' category gets the benefit of ACPS. But the similar category of employees in the aided private Ashram Schools who perform identical duties have been denied the benefit of ACPS which infringes their fundamental rights under Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India. The action of denial of benefits to the similarly placed employees discharging similar duties is arbitrary and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution of India.

18. Only on the basis of purported ground of financial crunch, we fail to understand the approach of the State Government of discriminating between the non-teaching staff of aided Ashram Schools and non-teaching staff of aided private Schools. At one stage both

the Schools were functioning under the control of only one department.

19. In our view the denial of benefit of ACPS amounts to discrimination, which is hit by the rights guaranteed by Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution of India."

6. In view of the decision rendered by the Division Bench, referred to above, the present petition deserves to be allowed, and the same is accordingly allowed.

7. The respondents are directed to examine the case of each individual petitioner for deciding whether, they satisfy the criteria laid down for claiming benefits under the ACPS to the private aided schools under the Government Resolution dated 30<sup>th</sup> April 1998, as modified from time to time, and if it is found that the petitioners are entitled to claim benefits under the ACPS and if they satisfy

the eligibility criteria, the respondents shall extend the benefits to the petitioners. The respondents shall scrutinize the case of individual petitioner within a period of six months and extend the benefits to such of the petitioners who are found eligible, as expeditiously as possible, preferably, within a period of six months from such scrutiny.

8. Rule made absolute in the above terms. The Writ Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

**[SANGITRAO S. PATIL, J.]**

**[S.S. SHINDE, J.]**

kbp