

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

WRIT PETITION NO.43 OF 2017

East Khandesh Education
Society through its
President. ... Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra
and others. ... Respondents.

...

Mr.A.G.Talhar, advocate for the petitioner.
Mr.V.S.Badakh, A.G.P. for the State.
Mr.V.D.Salunke, advocate for Respondent No.4.

...

**CORAM : S.V.GANGAPURWALA AND
SANGITRAO S. PATIL, JJ.**

Date : 25.04.2017.

PER COURT :

1. The grievance of the petitioner is that the Inquiry Committee be constituted to hold the inquiry against the allegations made by the petitioner vide his representation dated 20.10.2016.

2. Mr.Talhar, learned counsel submits that upon the allegations made by Respondent No.4, six Members Inquiry Committee is constituted. The report is submitted on 23.3.2017 by the Inquiry Committee to the Deputy Director of Education, Nashik Division. On 20.3.2017, the petitioner as a President of the Trust has submitted his detail say. The same is not considered by the Inquiry Committee. The said detail say filed on 20.3.2017 be directed to be considered by the Committee.

3. Mr.Salunke, learned counsel for the Respondent No.4 and learned A.G.P. for the other Respondents submit that thrice the Inquiry Committee had issued notices to the petitioner, however, the petitioner did not remain present nor filed his say or gave statement before the Committee.

4. The petitioner claims to be the President of the Trust. M.E.P.S. Rules are self-explanatory for action to be taken against an erring employee by the Management. We need not

dilate upon the same.

5. As far as the grievance of the petitioner about his stand not being considered by the Inquiry Committee, it is to be noted that thrice notices were issued to the President of the petitioner Trust, however, no say was filed by the President of the Trust nor any statement was given. In fact, it was duty of the petitioner to cooperate in the inquiry and file his say. The report it appears is already submitted by the Inquiry Committee to the Deputy Director of Education, Nashik Division. The petitioner may file his say to the Deputy Director of Education, Nashik Division, which would be considered before passing any further order by the Deputy Director of Education.

6. The Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

(SANGITRAO S. PATIL, J.)

(S.V.GANGAPURWALA, J.)

asp/office/wp43.17

