

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

27 WRIT PETITION NO.2402 OF 2022

PRIYANKA RAVINDRA PATIL

VERSUS

THE EDUCATION OFFICER (SECONDARY) AND ANOTHER

...

Mr. R.S. Pawar, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr.S.B. Yawalkar, AGP for the respondent/State.
Mr.S.S. Dambe, advocate for respondent no.2.

...

CORAM : S.V. GANGAPURWALA
AND
S.G. DIGE, JJ.

DATE : 21st FEBRUARY, 2022

PER COURT :-

. The proposal seeking approval to the appointment of the petitioner as Lab Assistant is rejected basically on the ground that the details were not forthcoming along with the proposal. The staffing pattern of the relevant year i.e. the year in which the petitioner was appointed, was not forwarded with the proposal, the copy of the advertisement was not annexed and so also other deficiencies.

2. It is submitted that the petitioner was appointed on the post, that was admissible in view of the increase in the students and not upon retirement of any person. The petitioner have to place on record the copy of the sanctioned post.

3. The learned counsel submits that the

petitioner would go to the Education Officer once again complying with all the deficiencies.

4. The learned A.G.P. submits that in fact the Management has to comply with all the deficiencies.

5. Certainly the Management would have to comply all the deficiencies.

6. Respondent No.2 shall comply with all the deficiencies as is noted in the impugned order rejecting the proposal seeking approval to the appointment of the petitioner. The fresh proposal be submitted by respondent no.2 by complying all the deficiencies as is recorded in the impugned order.

7. If the fresh proposal is submitted, the Education Officer shall reconsider the said proposal on its own merits and in accordance with law preferably within six months from the receipt of the proposal. In that event the impugned order would not be an impediment.

8. The Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

(S.G.DIGE, J.)
SGA

(S.V. GANGAPURWALA, J.)