

(1)

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

WRIT PETITION NO.6062 OF 2017

Abuj Appasahevb Kahinath,
Age: 50 years, Occu: Service,
Beed, Tq. and Dist. Beed

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
Through Secretary, Education &
Sports Department, Mantralaya,
Mumbai-32
2. The Director of Education,
Maharashtra State, Pune
3. The Deputy Director of Education,
Latur Division, Latur,
Tq. and Dist. Latur
4. The Education Officer (Primary),
Zillah Parishad, Beed,
District Beed
5. Head Master,
Chatrapati Shahu P. S.,
Shahu Nagar, Beed
6. Jijamata S. P. Mandal, Beed,
Through Secretary,
Shahu Nagar, Beed

..RESPONDENTS

Mr C. V. Thombre, Advocate for petitioner;
Mr S. M. Ganachari, A.G.P. for respondent Nos.1 to 3;
Mr P. D. Suryawanshi, Advocate for respondent No.4

**CORAM : PRASANNA B. VARALE
AND
MANISH PITALE, JJ.**

DATE : 26th September, 2018

ORAL ORDER:

The petitioner is a Teacher appointed in the school, namely, Shri Chhatrapati Shahu primary school being managed by respondent no.6 society. The grievance of the petitioner is, though he is entitled for a pay scale of a trained graduate teacher and though necessary proposal was submitted to the Education Officer (Primary) by respondent no.6 management on 25th October, 2012 and received by the Education Officer on the very day, the proposal is not decided as yet. This being a very limited grievance raised by the petitioner and there is no dispute on the factual aspects, namely, the petitioner is working with respondent no.6 management and the proposal is submitted by the management to Education Officer (Primary) on 25th October, 2012, in our opinion, the petition can be disposed of by issuing necessary directions to respondent Education Officer (Primary), Zilla Parishad, Beed.

2. Mr Suryawanshi, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of respondent no.4 Education Officer (Primary) submitted that respondent no.6 ought to have submitted a fresh proposal, but there is no reason coming forward to state why respondent no.6 needed to submit a fresh proposal when the proposal is already submitted by the management in the year 2012 and is pending consideration of the Education Officer (Primary) till date. In view thereof, respondent no.4 Education Officer (Primary) is directed to forward

(3)

a communication to respondents no.5 and 6, if he needs certain additional documents, apart from the documents submitted to him along with the earlier proposal. The said documents or deficiencies be pointed out in the communication and respondent no.6 be granted time of two weeks to submit the necessary documents. On receipt of the communication from the Education Officer (Primary), if there is no need of any additional documents, the Education Officer (Primary) to decide the proposal submitted to him on 25th October, 2012, within four weeks from today and in case there are certain deficiencies pointed out by the Education Officer (Primary) to respondent no.6 management, the proposal be decided within six weeks from the date of the order of this Court.

Writ Petition is disposed of with the above directions.

(MANISH PITALE, J.)

(PRASANNA B. VARALE, J.)

amj

Anant
Manohar
Joshi

Digitally
signed by
Anant
Manohar Joshi
Date:
2018.09.27
16:07:27
+0530