

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

APPELLATE SIDE, BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.2000 OF 2011

Kisan Shikshan Prasarak Mandal, Hadolthi Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO.2003 OF 2011

WRIT PETITION NO.2034 OF 2011

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

Mr.A.N.Irpatgire, advocate for the petitioner.

Mrs.A.V.Gondhalekar, Addl. Government Pleader for the State.

Mr.U.S.Malte, advocate for Respondent No.3.

**CORAM : S.V.GANGAPURWALA AND
K.L.WADANE, JJ.**

Date : 22.12.2016.

PER COURT :

1. Heard.

2. Mr.Irpatgire, learned counsel submits that the petitioners in these Writ Petitions are the Educational Institutions. They had applied for opening new College, pursuant to the advertisement issued by the Director of Higher Education, Maharashtra State, Pune. The learned counsel submits that the said proposal is refused to be accepted erroneously. The Government Resolution dated 12.8.2010 is being misread by the authorities. There are no

Colleges in the Talukas, wherein these petitioners had applied for opening new Colleges and as such the petitioners would be entitled to open a new College on grant-in-aid basis.

3. The learned Additional Government Pleader for the State and Mr.Malte, learned counsel for the University submit that the Government Resolution dated 12.8.2010 is self-explanatory. The place where the petitioners had applied is not included for permitting of opening new Colleges. The said Government Resolution covers those institutions who are already in existence either on no grant basis or permanent no grant basis.

4. The petitioners may not be in a position to take benefit of G.R. dated 12.8.2010. Annexure A to the G.R. gives the details of the Talukas, wherein there are Colleges on permanent no grant basis and Annexure B gives details of the Talukas, wherein there is no College in existence. The place where the petitioner had applied is not included in Annexure B, so also with the corresponding faculty.

5. Moreover, the claim of the petitioners has also become stale.

6. Considering above, the Writ Petitions stand disposed of. No costs.

(K . L . WADANE , J .)

(S . V . GANGAPURWALA , J .)

Dt.22.12.2016.
asp/office/wp2000.11

