

vdk

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 9041 OF 2017

Milind Vidya Prasarak Mandal,
Kinwat, Tq. Kinwat, Dist. Nanded
through its Secretary and anotherPetitioners

VERSUS

The State of Maharashtra and others Respondents

.....

Mr. V. S. Panpatte, Advocate for petitioners
Mr. A. V. Deshmukh, Assistant Government Pleader for
respondents no. 1 to 3.
Mr. R. K. Ingole Patil, Advocate for respondent no. 4
.....

[CORAM : SUNIL P. DESHMUKH AND
B. U. DEBADWAR, JJ.]

DATE : 10th December, 2019

ORDER :

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel appearing for respective respondents.

2. It appears that petitioners have moved proposals for annexing additional 6th and 7th standards under natural growth of students in petitioner no. 2 – school pursuant to the then

government policy. It is being submitted on behalf of petitioners that proposals have been recommended twice to the deputy director of education on '*no grant-in-aid*' basis.

3. Learned counsel purports to point out that there were lot of proposals which had been forwarded and were given approval to run 5th to 7th standards classes on natural growth on '*no grant-in-aid*' basis and those are about 350 in number. This, according to learned counsel, is during the period of 2014-2015, however, as yet, no approval has been granted to petitioners' proposal.

4. Learned counsel apprehends that, may be the decision now would be rendered according to now prevailing policy, while the same will have to be taken into account by concerned authority according to then prevailing policy. In similar circumstances, quite a few proposals were granted according to the then prevailing policy of the government.

5. In view of aforesaid, since the proposals are pending and resting with the deputy director of education, he would take a call and appropriately decide on the proposals as early as possible, preferably, within a period of three (3) months from the date of receipt of writ of this order.

6. Needless to refer to that aforesaid observations shall not influence decision in accordance with merits.

7. Writ petition stands disposed of in terms of aforesaid direction.

[B. U. DEBADWAR]
JUDGE

[SUNIL P. DESHMUKH]
JUDGE

vdK/9041.17WP