

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO.982 OF 2020

Deendayal Shikshan Sanstha and Anr.	..Petitioners
V/s.	
State of Maharashtra & Ors.	..Respondents

.....

Mr. Santosh S. Jagtap, Advocate for Petitioners.
Mr. N. R. Bubna, Advocate for Respondent No.3.
Ms. M. S. Bane, AGP for Respondent Nos.1, 4 & 5 / State.

**CORAM : C.V. BHADANG, J.
DATE : 30th JANUARY, 2020**

P.C.

. The petitioner is respondent No.1 before the School Tribunal in Appeal No.37/2018 filed by the respondent No.3 herein. That appeal is filed by the third respondent challenging his termination. Said appeal is filed somewhere in June 2018. The petitioner has filed reply on 10/10/2018 and the said appeal is said to be part heard before the School Tribunal at Mumbai.

2. The challenge in this petition is to the order dated 6/11/2019 passed by the School Tribunal of which the operative part reads thus.

ORDER

1. *Adjourned till 7/12/2019;*
2. *The appeal is directed to be heard expeditiously and is to be disposed by the end of December 2019;*

3. *Respondent No.1 to secure stay of Hon'ble Higher Forum in appropriate proceeding by the next date or proceed with hearing;*
4. *Parties to note.*

3. Learned counsel for the parties have pointed out that the appeal is now fixed on 10/2/2020. Be that as it may, the only contention raised on behalf of the petitioner is that the petitioner has made certain grievance against the Presiding Officer of the School Tribunal seeking transfer of the appeal to some other School Tribunal. During the course of the arguments, at bar, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the apprehension of the petitioner that he will not get a fair trial at the hands of School Tribunal is that some other appeal pertaining to a different teacher has been allowed by the School Tribunal. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to go into such allegations. For the present, it is difficult to see as to how the impugned order results into any manifest injustice or prejudicially affects the rights of the petitioner. In this regard, reliance can be placed on the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Shalini Shayam Shetty & Anr. Vs. Rajendra Shankar Patil (2010) 8 SCC 329**. No case for interference in the supervisory jurisdiction of this Court under Article 227 of the

Constitution of India is made out. The petition is dismissed with no order as to costs.

C.V. BHADANG, J.