

vks

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.1567 F 2012.

Jignasa Parikh		Petitioner
V/s.		
The Municipal Corporation of Greater Bombay and ors		Respondents

Mr. C. R. Sadasivan, for the petitioner.
Mr. Aseem Naphade, a/w Ambika Singh I/by S.R. Srivastav, for
respondent Nos 4 and 5.
Mr. H.C. Pimpale, for respondent Nos 1 to 3.

CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
DR. SHALINI PHANSALKAR-JOSHI, JJ.
DATE : 14th MARCH 2016

P.C. :

1. The services of the petitioner came to be terminated by respondent No.4 and this order is challenged by filing present Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.
2. In terms of Rule 20 of the Maharashtra Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Rules, 2011, appeal in such case lies before the School Tribunal, established under the provisions of Maharashtra Employees of Private Schools (Conditions of Service) Regulation Act, 1977. Since the petitioner has an alternate and efficacious remedy of appeal, we are not inclined to entertain this petition and the same is accordingly dismissed.
3. Needless to state that petitioner is at liberty approach

the School Tribunal with an appeal with a delay condonation application. In the delay condonation application before the School Tribunal, the petitioner is entitled to claim the benefit of Section 14 of the Limitation Act, 1963, for the period of pendency of the present Writ Petition.

(DR. SHALINI PHANSALKAR-JOSHI, J.)

(RANJIT MORE, J.)