

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.**

WRIT PETITION NO. 3459 OF 2021

- 1) Sudhir S/o Narayanrao Satone,
Aged about 31 years, Occ. - Service,
- 2) Ku. Archana D/o Rameshrao Kale,
Aged about – years, Occ. Service,

Both R/o. C/o. Sent John Madhyamik
Vidyalay (Marathi Medium),
Chitoda road, Borgaon Meghe,
Wardha.

.... **PETITIONERS**

// VERSUS //

- 1) State of Maharashtra,
Through its Secretary,
Department of School Education
and Sport, Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
- 2) Education Officer (Secondary),
Zilla Parishad, Wardha.
- 3) New Adarsha Shikshan Sanstha,
Pulgaon, Tah. Deoli, Dist. Wardha,
Through its Secretary/President.
- 4) Sent John Madhyamik Vidyalay
(Marathi Medium), Chitoda road,
Borgaon Meghe, Wardha,
Through its Head Master.

.... **RESPONDENTS**

Shri N. S. Warulkar, Advocate for the petitioners.
Shri A. S. Fulzele, Addl.G.P for respondent No.1.

**CORAM : SUNIL B. SHUKRE AND
ANIL S. KILOR, JJ.**

DATED : 14.09.2021

ORAL JUDGMENT : (Per Sunil B. Shukre, J.)

1. Heard Shri Warulkar, learned counsel for the petitioners and Shri A. S. Fulzele, learned Addl. G.P, who appears by waiving notice for respondent No.1 and 2. There is no need to issue notice to respondent Nos.3 and 4 as no relief has been claimed against them.

2. **Rule.** Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally by consent of the learned counsel appearing for the parties.

3. The issue involved in this petition is about grant of approval to the appointments of the petitioners as Assistant Teachers. The facts, as disclosed by the proposal dated 25.01.2021, show that as per the letter dated 17.12.2018, the State Government had directed the Education Officer to grant approval to the appointments of the petitioners, but respondent No.2/Education Officer did not do so and rather sent an adverse report to the State Government. These facts also show that now a proposal has been sent directly to respondent No.1 for grant of approval to the appointments of the petitioners, and this proposal dated 25.01.2021 is still pending with the respondent No.1.

4. We are of the view that by issuing suitable directions to the respondent No.1, this petition can be disposed of.

5. Accordingly, the writ petition is **partly allowed**.

6. The respondent No.1 is directed to decide the proposal dated 25.01.2021, in accordance with law, as early as possible and in any case within a period of eight weeks from the date of the order.

Rule accordingly. No costs.

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)

(SUNIL B. SHUKRE J.)