

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

WRIT PETITION NO.4820 OF 2016

Vinod s/o. Shravan Patil
and three others ..Petitioners

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra
and ors. ..Respondents

--

Mr.A.D.Pawar, Advocate for petitioner
Mrs.M.A.Deshpande, AGP for respondent nos.1 to 4 –
State

--

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.4819 OF 2016

Babasaheb s/o. Bhausahab Shinde
and nine others ..Petitioners

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra
and ors. ..Respondents

--

Mr.A.D.Pawar, Advocate for petitioner
Mr.V.S.Badakh, AGP for respondent nos.1 to 4 –
State

--

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.4821 OF 2016

Jagdish s/o. Shesherao Ghute
and three others ..Petitioners

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra
and ors. ..Respondents

Mr.A.D.Pawar, Advocate for petitioner
Mr.S.B.Yawalkar, AGP for respondent nos.1 to 4 –
State

--

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.4822 OF 2016

Vasudeo s/o. Ramkrushna Netragaonkar
and anr. ..Petitioners

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra
and ors. ..Respondents

--

Mr.A.D.Pawar, Advocate for petitioner

Mr.V.S.Badakh, AGP for respondent nos.1 to 4 –
State

--

AND

WRIT PETITION NO.4826 OF 2016

Shankar s/o. Shantram Ranmale
and 37 ors. ..Petitioners

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra
and ors. ..Respondents

--

Mr.A.D.Pawar, Advocate for petitioner
Mr.B.V.Virdhe, AGP for respondent nos.1 to 4 –
State

--

AND
WRIT PETITION NO.4827 OF 2016

Mahadeo Ramrao Daund
and 02 ors.

..Petitioners

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra
and ors.

..Respondents

--

Mr.A.D.Pawar, Advocate for petitioner
Mr.S.B.Yawalkar, AGP for respondent nos.1 to 4 –
State

--

CORAM : S.S. SHINDE AND
SANGITRAO S. PATIL, JJ.

DATE : JULY 07, 2016

PER COURT :

Heard.

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

3. The petitioners are employees of the 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 these petitions is no more *res-integra* in view of an unreported 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 21st 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 petitions deserve to be allowed, and the same are 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 30th 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.]