

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

20. WRIT PETITION NO. 8444 of 2018

Smt. Mrudula W/o Martand Palshikar	... <u>Petitioner</u>
<u>VERSUS</u>	
The State of Maharashtra and others	... <u>Respondents</u>

Mr. Shivaji T. Shelke, Advocate for petitioner
Mr. P.S. Patil, Addl. Government Pleader for respondents No. 1 & 2
Mr. D.B. Pawar, Advocate for respondent No.3
Dr. R.J. Godbole, Advocate for respondents No. 4 & 5

CORAM : S.V. GANGAPURWALA

AND

AVINASH G. GHAROTE, JJ.

DATE : 27th November, 2019

PER COURT :

1. One of the grounds for rejection of the proposal for approval is that the petitioner at the time of appointment was over age. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the proposal is submitted to respondent No.2- the Deputy Director of Education for relaxation of age. The proposal is submitted to respondent No.3-the Education Officer (Primary), Zilla Parishad, Aurangabad, on 3rd March 2006 to forward it to respondent No.2 -the Dy. Director of Education, Aurangabad, for the purpose of age relaxation. The same is not yet forwarded.

2. In case the said proposal is pending with the Deputy Director of Education, then the Deputy Director of Education shall take decision upon the proposal of age relaxation on its own merits. In case such proposal is not processed, the petitioner and respondent No.4- management may submit the proposal afresh, which shall be considered and decided by the Deputy Director of Education, preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the proposal.

3. Depending upon the decision taken by the Dy. Director of Education on the proposal of age relaxation, respondent No.3- Education Officer shall reconsider the case of the petitioner for its approval on its own merits.

4. The writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

(AVINASH G. GHAROTE)
JUDGE

Madkar

(S.V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE