

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 4763 OF 2020

C. Tech Computer Centre
Through its Director
Sachin S/o Pralhad Pawar
and others

... Petitioners.

Versus

The Union of India
and others

... Respondents.

....

Mr. S. S. Thombre, Advocate for the Petitioners.
Mr. A.R. Kale, A.G.P. for Respondent No,1.

....

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

DATE : 17th MARCH, 2021

PER COURT:-

1. We have heard Mr. Thombre, learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. The affidavit is filed by the respondent- Assistant Commissioner In-charge District Skill Development, Employment and Entrepreneurship, Guidance Center, Beed. Para 9 of the affidavit reads thus:

“9. I say and submit that, as per the show cause notice the Respondent had asked the Petitioners to state the reasons for not cancelling their enrolment of the vocational training institutes. In this notice the Respondent has nowhere stated that they are issuing a recovery notice to the Petitioner. The Petitioner hereby misinterpreted the language of the show cause notice. The mere intention of the Respondent for issuing this show cause notice is to follow the provisions of the schemes of the Government of Maharashtra. The Government of Maharashtra is spending lot of government funds as well as efforts for making the better future of the youth. If the Petitioner is having the mala fide intentions to gulp the government funds and they think that they don't have any responsibility towards the attainment of the object of these Policies. Then the Respondent can act in the best interest of the Government or issue show cause notices to the Petitioners as well as the recovery notices in future. The Respondent further submits that the Government of Maharashtra is trying their level best to give employment/self-employment to trainees under the Scheme. To follow the provisions of the schemes of the Government of Maharashtra the Respondent issued a show cause notice to the petitioner. Copies of the show cause notices dated 4.06.2020, 2.6.2020 and 26.05.2020 and answer's of the VTP's are annexed herewith and marked as EXHIBIT-R-5 collectively.”

3. It appears that the petition is premature. The petitioner has already filed the say to the show cause notice given in the present writ petition. The respondent will have to consider the say filed by the petitioner to the show cause notice and then take further decision in tune with the policy of the Government.

4. In view of that, as the respondent is yet to take decision after considering the say and the policy of the Government, we do not find it appropriate to entertain the petition at this stage. All contentions of the respective parties are kept open.

5. In case some decision taken is adverse to the petitioners, the petitioners may liberty to assail the same.

6. The writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

(SHRIKANT D. KULKARNI)
JUDGE

(S.V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE

S.P Rane