

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 3900 OF 2015

Jaitapur Education Society
Versus

..Petitioner

The State of Maharashtra through
Director, Education Secondary and
Higher Secondary, Pune and ors.

..Respondents

Mr. S. D. Butala i/b. Mr. Harshad Bhadbhade, advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. S. S. Bhende, AGP for respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 5.
Ms. Anita Murgude, advocate for respondent No.3.
Mr. Saurabh S. Pakale, advocate for respondent No.4.

**CORAM : SHANTANU KEMKAR &
RANJIT MORE, JJ.**

DATE : 2nd MAY, 2016.

P. C. :

Parties through their counsel.

2. Rule. Rule is made returnable forthwith and is taken up for hearing by consent.

3. The petitioner-Institution has alleged that respondent No.2 has not decided its proposal dated 22nd January, 2015 at "Exhibit -G "for appointment of principal. According to learned AGP, a decision has already been taken and the proposal dated 22nd January, 2015 has been rejected. However, we find that there is no decision as to who will be the permanent Headmaster of the Institution and we find that only a

stopgap arrangement has been made authorizing one Smt. Suruchi Sadanand Kamtekar as authorized signatory for day-to-day work and that arrangement has been made from 1st February, 2016 to 30th April, 2016, and thereafter, it has been extended.

4. Having regard to the fact that the dispute inter se between the petitioner, respondent No.3, one Mr.Suresh A. Jadhav and Smt. Suruchi Sadanand Kamtekar has to be resolved by making permanent arrangement of the Headmaster, we dispose of this petition by directing respondent No.2-Education Officer, Secondary Education Department, Zilla Parishad-Ratnagiri. to take a final decision in the matter after giving an opportunity of hearing to all concerned. Let the decision as aforesaid be taken in accordance with law as expeditiously as possible but not later than four weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order. So far as challenge to the appointment of 4th respondent on the post of teacher is concerned, the petitioner would be at liberty to file a fresh petition. In view of aforesaid, the petition is disposed of.

[RANJIT MORE, J.]

[SHANTANU KEMKAR, J.]