

Ladda(PS).

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION No. 5515 of 2017.

Kalambist Panchkroshi Shikshan
Prasarak Mandal, Kalambist & OrsPetitioners.
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.

WITH
WRIT PETITION No. 9748 of 2017.

Gram Vikas Shaikshan Mandal,
Ainwadi & OrsPetitioners.
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.

WITH
WRIT PETITION No. 9749 of 2017.

Gram Vikas Shaikshan Mandal,
Ainwadi & OrsPetitioners.
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.

WITH
WRIT PETITION No. 9750 of 2017.

Gram Vikas Shaikshan Mandal,
Ainwadi & OrsPetitioners.
Vs
The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.

WITH
WRIT PETITION No. 9751 of 2017.

Gram Vikas Shaikshan Mandal,
Ainwadi & OrsPetitioners.
Vs

The State of Maharashtra & OrsRespondents.

Mr. Prashant Bhavake, Advocate for the petitioners in all the petitions.

Mr. C.P. Yadav, A.G.P. for the State.

**CORAM : ANOOP V. MOHTA &
SMT. BHARATI H.DANGRE, JJ.**
DATE : 11th September, 2017.

FINAL ORDER :-

- 1) Rule. Rule is made returnable forthwith. Heard finally by consent of parties.
- 2) As the common issues are involved in all the writ petitions, we are inclined to dispose of the above writ petitions by this common order, as agreed by the Counsel for respective parties. Learned A.G.P. waives service of notice for the Respondent-State in all the matters.
- 3) In the above writ petitions, the petitioners have challenged the order/communication of the Education Officer, thereby refusing approval to the appointment of petitioner No.3 in all the above petitions.
- 4) For the sake of clarity the name of petitioner No.3 in each petition is mentioned as below:

Sr. No.	Civil Writ - Petition No.	Name of petitioner No.3/ Shikshan Sevak.

1)	5515 of 2017	:	Smt.Shradha Ravindra Salgaonkar.
2)	9748 of 2017	:	Shri Vinodkumar Babaso Khade
3)	9749 of 2017	:	Shri Kiran Prabhakar Bhagare
4)	9750 of 2017	:	Shri Sham Shravan Ahire
5)	9751 of 2017	:	Shri Vikram Bhimrao Kabir

5) The grievance of the petitioners in the above writ petitions is that petitioner No.3 in above petitions were appointed as Shikshan Sevak after following due procedure and on ascertainment of their qualifications and the appointments were for a period of three years on monthly fixed salary. Thereafter, proposal of petitioner No.3 in each of the petitions was forwarded to the Education Officer for grant of approval along with necessary documents. The proposal for approval was pending for considerable time with the Education Officer, who ultimately rejected the approval in view of the Government Resolution dated 2nd May, 2012 by which the State had imposed a ban on recruitment of teachers and as such appointments made by the Management was termed as illegal. By the said Government Resolution the State had imposed a ban on the post of recruitment of assistant teachers until such time of hundred per cent absorption of surplus teachers. However, subsequently on 4th September, 2013 the ban has been relaxed by the State Government

in relation to subject of English, Mathematics and Science.

6) The petitioners have challenged the rejection and/or refusal of approval on the said ground contending that each petitioner No.3 in the above petitions was qualified for the post of Shikshan Sevak and the approval has been refused only on the ground that the appointment has been made after issuance of Government Resolution dated 2nd May, 2012. Similar issue was raised before this Court in a bunch of connected writ petitions which was dealt by a Division Bench of this Court (Coram: B.R.Gavai & Riyaz I. Chagla, JJ) in W.P. No.8587/2016 and connected matters on 10th July, 2017 and this Court was pleased to allow the writ petition and has quashed and set aside the impugned order after referring the judgment and orders passed in Writ Petition No. 10580 of 2015 with W.P. No. 1145 of 2016 decided on 9th March, 2017. The paragraphs 6, 7 and 8 of the said judgment in W.P. No. 8587/2016 are reproduced below for ready reference :-

6. We find that if the Education Officers do not send the surplus teachers within reasonable time, the schools can not be expected to run without teachers for years together. Undisputedly, finding it difficult to send surplus teachers for the subjects of English, Maths and Science, the State Government itself has relaxed the rigour of government resolution dated 2nd May 2012 vide GR dated 4th

September 2013. It could further be seen that State Government also vide that GR relaxed the ban where the selection process has already commenced on 6th September 2012.

7. In that view of the matter, we find that in view of subsequent GRs and in view of the view taken by Division Bench of this Court, the ban would not be applicable to three Writ Petition No. 10580 of 2015 with 1145 of 2016 decided on 9th March 2017. categories, one where the recruitment process is already commenced prior to GR dated 2nd May 2012, second, in so far as the appointment made for the subjects of English, Maths and Science are concerned and third, where the recruitment is made to fulfill the backlog of reserved category candidates.

8. We find that at the same time the State should take into consideration, that such situations arise on account of inaction of its own Education Officers. If Education Officers act promptly and ensure that the surplus teachers are absorbed in the schools wherever there is a vacancy, such a situation would not arise. However, as already observed hereinabove on account of inaction on the part of Education Officers, right which has become fundamental, in view of amendment to the constitution by which Article 21A brought in the Constitution, cannot be permitted to be frustrated. The schools are not expected to run without teachers for years together. The State would always be at liberty to take appropriate action against its officers, on account of who's inaction the State exchequer will be burdened.

7) In the result, the said Division Bench was pleased to quash and set aside the impugned orders and directed the

Respondents – Education Officers to examine cases independently and grant approval to each of the teachers who fall in the following three categories:-

- (a) Where the recruitment process is already commenced prior to GR dated 2nd May 2012;
- (b) where the appointments made for filling up vacancies in English, Mathematics and Science;
- (c) where the recruitment is made to fulfill the backlog of reserve categories candidates;

10. The necessary orders after hearing the management and teachers be passed within a period of six weeks from today.”

8) The said Division Bench also observed that upon grant of approval necessary steps would be taken for paying salary to such teachers who are found eligible and salaries would be paid to them within a period of 12 weeks from the date of the order.

9) The issue involved in the above writ petitions is clearly governed by the order passed by the Division Bench in Writ Petition No. 8587 of 2016 and other connected matters decided on 10th July, 2017. Hence, the following order:-

ORDER.

1) The above Writ Petitions are allowed and impugned orders are quashed and set aside. The respondents-Education officers are directed to decide the case of each petitioner No.3 in all the above writ petitions by affording opportunity of hearing to the Management and the Petitioners within a period of six weeks and the Education Officer who will examine as to whether the recruitment process is commenced prior to GR dated 2nd May, 2012 and whether the appointment was made for filling up vacancies in English, Mathematics and Science and also whether the recruitment is made to fulfill the backlog of reserved categories candidates.

2) Upon grant of approval necessary steps would be taken for payment of salary to each petitioner No.3 in above writ petitions who are found eligible and the salary would be paid within a period of 12 weeks from the date of this order. All the concerned to act on an authenticated copy of this order.

(SMT. BHARATI H.DANGRE, J)

(ANOOP V. MOHTA, J)