

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

WRIT PETITION NO. 623 OF 2016

Shri Gurudatta Bahuuddeshiya Sanstha, thr.its Secretary Shri Vijay Keshavrao Wagh

-vs-

The State of Maharashtra, thr.its Secretary, Department of Higher & Technical Education & anr..

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders.

Mr. A.I.Sheikh, counsel for the petitioner.
Mr. S.J.Kadu, AGP for the respondent No.1.
Ms Dashputre, counsel h/f Mr. P.B.Patil, counsel for the respondent No.2.

CORAM : SMT. VASANTI A NAIK &
MRS. SWAPNA JOSHI, JJ.

DATE : 21.11.2016.

By this writ petition, the petitioner challenges the order of the State Government, dated 09/06/2015 rejecting the proposal of the petitioner for starting a new course. The petitioner seeks a direction against the State Government to grant permission in favour of the petitioner, as recommended by the respondent No.2-University.

It was stated on behalf of the petitioner on 24/06/2016 that the University had found the proposal of the petitioner to be in order and had recommended to the State Government that the petitioner could be granted permission to start a new course. According to the petitioner, though in the impugned order, it is mentioned that there are more than five deficiencies in the proposal of the petitioner, the University had found none.

Since more than three years had lapsed from the date of preparation of the report/recommendation by the University, dated 28/04/2013, we had asked the University to reinspect the college of the petitioner and submit a fresh report. On 05/10/2016, this Court had perused the report tendered by the University in pursuance of our order, dated 24/06/2016 and observed that the said report supported the claim of the petitioner for grant of permission to start a new course.

The State Government was granted two weeks time to make a statement on the report submitted by the University.

Shri Kadu, the learned Assistant Government Pleader appearing for the State Government, states on instructions received vide communication dated 19/10/2016 that a decision on the proposal of the petitioner would be taken within two months. It is stated that the report submitted by the University would be considered by the State Government and an appropriate order would be passed within two months.

By accepting the statement made on behalf of the State Government that would be binding on the State Government, we dispose of the writ petition with no order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE