

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

WRIT PETITION NO.1203 OF 2018

Shaikh Wajidpasha Shukur. Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and another. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 683 OF 2018

Santosh Ramrao More. Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 689 OF 2018

Suhas Vilas Barkul. Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 693 OF 2018

Satish Zumbar Waghmare. Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 694 OF 2018

Kiran Gautam Mane. Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others. Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 695 OF 2018

Sandip Satish Patil.

Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others.

Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 696 OF 2018

Ravikanth Kisanrao Kolhe.

Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others.

Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 697 OF 2018

Amarsinha Bapusaheb Deshmukh

Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others.

Respondents.

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 698 OF 2018

Satish Babruwan Madke.

Petitioner.

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others.

Respondents.

Mr. A.R. Tapse, Advocate for the petitioner in WP No.1203/2018.

Mr. C.R. Thorat, Advocate for the petitioners in other petitions.

Mr. N.T. Bhagat, A.G.P. for the State.

Mr. P.D. Suryawanshi, Advocate for respondent Nos.4 and 5 in all petitions.

CORAM : **S.V. GANGAPURWALA &
SUNIL K. KOTWAL, JJ.**

Dated : **29th June, 2018.**

FINAL ORDER :-

. Heard Mr. Tapse, learned Counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Suryawanshi, learned Counsel for respondent Nos.4 and 5.

2. According to the petitioners, they have been appointed on the post of 'Shikshan Sevak' after following due procedure of law. The petitioners are seeking directions against respondent Nos.4 and 5 to forward the proposal seeking approval to their appointments.

3. Mr. Suryawanshi, learned Counsel submits that at once the respondents had sent the proposals, but were taken back. Mr. Suryawanshi, learned Counsel on instructions, submits that respondent Nos.4 and 5 would submit fresh proposals complete in all respects seeking approval to the appointments of the petitioners, within four weeks.

4. The statement is accepted.

5. Upon receipt of the proposal, the Education Officer shall take decision upon the said proposal on its own merits, in accordance with law and policy, preferably within four months from the date of receipt of proposal.

6. Writ petitions are disposed of. No costs.

(SUNIL K. KOTWAL)
JUDGE

(S.V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE