

Urmila Ingale

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 4223 OF 2019

Miraj Vidya Samiti Sangli and anr. .. Petitioners
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra and anr. .. Respondents

Mr.Ashutosh B. Patil i/b Mr.Vinayak R.Kumbhar, for the
Petitioners.
Mr.K.S.Thorat, AGP for State.

CORAM : M.S.KARNIK, J.

DATE : 08th APRIL, 2019

P.C. :

. Rule. By consent, Rule made returnable forthwith
and heard finally. Learned AGP waives service of Rule for
Respondents.

2. Learned AGP raised objection that that the order
impugned in this Petition which is at page 26 of the paper-book
is not really an order rejecting the proposal for approval of the
appointment of the petitioner No.2 as assistant teacher. Learned
AGP would submit that the order records that the proposal has
to be submitted by the petitioner No.1- Management in terms of

G.R. dated 20/06/2014 in the camp which is organized in that regard.

3. In this view of the matter, though it is stated that the proposal would be submitted for individual approval in the camp to be held, the decision on the proposal cannot be delayed indefinitely. In these circumstances, camp as per G.R. dated 20/06/2014 is to be held when the proposal can be submitted. Learned Counsel for the petitioners would submit a proposal when such a camp is held. It is made clear that if no such camp is held within a period of 2 months from today, the petitioners are at liberty to file proposal before the Education Officer within a period of 4 weeks thereafter, which proposal shall be decided on its own merits by Education Officer without insistence on his part to have the proposal decided in the camp.

4. With these observations, Rule is made partly absolute and disposed of in the above terms.

(M.S.KARNIK, J.)