

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

905 WRIT PETITION NO.10316 OF 2017

HANMANT PANDHARI SHETTIWAR  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Panpatte V.S.  
AGP for Respondents No.1 to 3 : Mr. P. N. Kutti.  
Advocate for Respondent No.5 : Mr. P. S. Dikle.

...

**[ CORAM : SUNIL P. DESHMUKH AND  
SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, JJ.]**

**DATE : 05<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER, 2019.**

PER COURT :

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. In the affidavit filed on behalf of respondent No.3 on 03-12-2019, in paragraph No.6 it is stated with respect to the case of the petitioner that;

"I say and submit that, after hearing the parties the respondent No.3 i.e. office of the present deponent had cancelled the earlier approval vide decision dated 07-07-2017. I say that, thereafter, as per the direction of this Hon'ble High Court a hearing was conducted in the office of the Deputy Director of Education, Aurangabad on 23-10-2018. I say and submit that, at the time of hearing before the Deputy Director of Education, Aurangabad Region,

Aurangabad it was transpired that, the appointment of the petitioner is made from reserve category i.e. schedule tribe. I say that, the Asstt. Commissioner, B. C. cell has also verified the roster of the respondents No.4 and 5, therefore, the Deputy Director of Education, Aurangabad Region, Aurangabad confirmed the order dated 25-10-2013 passed by the Education Officer (Secondary), Zilla Parishad, Parbhani.”

3. In view of aforesaid, no further order would required to be passed except reference to date 25-10-2013 in aforesaid reproduced paragraph should be deemed to be to 21-10-2013 as parties are *ad idem* that there is typographical error in referring to date as 25 instead of 21. Writ petition accordingly is disposed of.

**[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]**  
**JUDGE**

**[ SUNIL P.DESHMUKH ]**  
**JUDGE**

vjg/-.