

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 11679 OF 2019

Rokda Hanuman Pratishthan and Multi
Purpose Institute, through President .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and another .. Respondents

Shri U. R. Awate, Advocate i/by Talekar and Associates,
Advocate for the Petitioner.

Shri A. R. Kale, A.G.P. for the Respondent No. 1.

Shri K. M. Suryawanshi, Advocate for the Respondent No. 2.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
SHRIKANT D. KULKARNI, JJ.**

DATE : 21ST JANUARY, 2020.

FINAL ORDER :

. The proposal of the petitioner for extension of new course viz M. Sc. Physics and M. Sc. Chemistry was recommended by the university. The State Government rejected it on the ground that there is change in the Government policy. The petitioner approached this Court by filing Writ Petition No. 10700 of 2017. This Court under order dated 07th September, 2018 directed that the proposal of the petitioner for extension of courses shall be considered for the academic year 2019-2020 on its own merits. The university again forwarded the proposal of the petitioner to the Government. The Government rejected the proposal of the petitioner under order dated 01.03.2019.

2. Mr. Awate, the learned advocate for the petitioner submits that, the petitioner has made all compliances with the university and submitted to the university under covering letter dated 16.07.2019. It is for the university to forward it to the Government. The proposal of the petitioner can be considered for the academic year 2020-2021.

3. Once proposal of the petitioner is already rejected on the ground that, there is change in policy, this Court directed the Government to consider the proposal of the petitioner for the next academic year. Pursuant to the directions of this Court, the Government rejected the proposal on the ground of deficiencies. It is submitted that, deficiencies are cleared subsequently under letter dated 16.07.2019.

4. The proposal has to be forwarded before the cut of date to the State Government i. e. 30th November of each year. It is not that the proposal of the petitioner is not considered, but the same is rejected on the ground of deficiencies, which according to the petitioner have been complied with subsequently. In view of the aforesaid scenario, it would not be possible to consider the request made by the petitioner.

5. The petitioner if so desirous and eligible may submit the proposal within the time frame as laid down U/Sec. 109 of the Maharashtra Universities Act to the university. Naturally, the university will have to process it and forward it before the cut of

date as provided to the Government.

6. In view of the above, the writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

[SHRIKANT D. KULKARNI, J.] [S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

bsb/Jan. 20