

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 5094 OF 2021

- PETITIONER :-**
1. The Nagpur Marysalian Society, P.T.R. No.F-1005(N), Having its registered office at Civil Lines, Nagpur, through its Secretary.
 2. Providence Girls High School, Through its Head Mistress, Civil Lines, Nagpur.
 3. Sweta Simon Philip, Aged about 28 years, Occ. Service, 157/B Ish Krupa, Welcome Society, Katol Road, Nagpur.

...VERSUS...

- RESPONDENTS :-**
1. State of Maharashtra, through its Secretary, Department of School Education and Sports, Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
 2. The Education Officer (Secondary), Zilla Parishad, Nagpur.

Mr.Bernard John, counsel for the petitioners.
Mr.A.A.Madiwale, AGP for the respondents.

**CORAM : SUNIL B.SHUKRE &
ANIL L. PANSARE, JJ.**

DATE : 15.12.2021.

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

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Government Pleader, who appears by waiving notice for the respondents.

2. Considering the short point involved in this petition, we have decided to take up the petition for final disposal.

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

4. Petitioner No.1-Society runs Petitioner No.2-School, which is seeking approval of the respondents to the appointment of petitioner No.3 on the post of Shikshan Sevak but, the proposal of petitioner No.2 is pending for decision with the respondents. Since the proposal has been sent but, no response so far has been given to the said proposal.

5. In the circumstances, we are of the view that purposes of this petition shall be served if suitable directions are issued to the respondents.

6. Accordingly, the petition is partly allowed. The respondents are directed to decide the proposal dated 30th September, 2019, sent by petitioner No.2 seeking approval to the appointment of petitioner No.3 on the post of Shikshan Sevak, appropriately in accordance with law as early as possible and in any case within three months from the date of the order.

7. Rule is made absolute in the above terms. No order as to costs.

(ANIL L. PANSARE, J)

(SUNIL B. SHUKRE, J)