

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 3681 OF 2017

Nicholas Piedade Rodrigues

....Petitioner.

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

....Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 3682 OF 2017

Nobert Selestin Desa

....Petitioner.

Vs.

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

....Respondents.

Mr. Chetan Patil for Petitioners.

Ms Rupali Shinde – AGP for State.

CORAM : ANOOP V. MOHTA AND
RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, JJ.

DATE : APRIL 27, 2017.

FINAL ORDER:-

1] We have heard learned counsel for the respective sides.

2] In both these petitions, the three petitioners though have prayed that they should be granted individual approval in so far as their appointments are concerned, it is submitted by the learned counsel that the proposals pending seeking such approval with the concerned Education Officer (Secondary), of respondent no. 3 Zilla Parishad should be decided within a time frame. He relies upon an ***order passed by this Court dated 26 October 2016 in writ petition no.***

12424 of 2016 Girija Abhijit Ghorpade vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

3] Learned counsel for the respective sides do not dispute that the proposals with regard to these petitioners are pending with the Education Officer (Secondary) and he being a Competent Authority, can decide the said proposals.

4] In the light of the above, both these petitions are disposed of by directing the respondent no. 3 to examine the pending proposals of these petitioners submitted by the respective employers keeping in view the law laid down by this Court in the matter of ***St. Francis De Sales Education Society vs. The State of Maharashtra & Anr. in writ petition no. 5547 of 2013 dated 30 September 2013.*** We expect the said Authority to decide the said proposals within a period of three months from today, on their own merits. Needless to state, we have not expressed any opinion with regard to the merits of the said proposals. No costs.

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

(ANOOP V. MOHTA, J.)