

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 5117 OF 2022

The Jalgaon Jilla Maratha Vidya
Prasarak Sahkari Samaj Ltd.

Through its Honorary Secretary
and another

.. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and another .. Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 5279 OF 2022

The Jalgaon Jilla Maratha Vidya
Prasarak Sahkari Samaj Ltd.

Through its Honorary Secretary
and another

.. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and another .. Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 5281 OF 2022

The Jalgaon Jilla Maratha Vidya
Prasarak Sahkari Samaj Ltd.

Through its Honorary Secretary
and another

.. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and another .. Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 5282 OF 2022

The Jalgaon Jilla Maratha Vidya
Prasarak Sahkari Samaj Ltd.

Through its Honorary Secretary
and another

.. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and another .. Respondents

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 5283 OF 2022

The Jalgaon Jilla Maratha Vidya
 Prasarak Sahkari Samaj Ltd.
 Through its Honorary Secretary
 and another .. Petitioners
Versus
 The State of Maharashtra and another .. Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5284 OF 2022

The Jalgaon Jilla Maratha Vidya
 Prasarak Sahkari Samaj Ltd.
 Through its Honorary Secretary
 and another .. Petitioners
Versus
 The State of Maharashtra and another .. Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5280 OF 2022

The Jalgaon Jilla Maratha Vidya
 Prasarak Sahkari Samaj Ltd.
 Through its Honorary Secretary
 and another .. Petitioners
Versus
 The State of Maharashtra and another .. Respondents

WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 5278 OF 2022

The Jalgaon Jilla Maratha Vidya
 Prasarak Sahkari Samaj Ltd.
 Through its Honorary Secretary
 and another .. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and another .. Respondents

Shri Abasaheb D. Shinde, Advocate for the Petitioners in all matters.

Shri A. S. Shinde, A.G.P. for the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

Shri Rajesh H. Mewara, Advocate for the Intervenor.

**CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL AND
SANDEEP V. MARNE, JJ.
DATE : 23.09.2022.**

FINAL ORDER (*Per Sandeep V. Marne, J.*) :-

. It is the case of the petitioners that on account of disputes in the management, an Administrator was appointed, who had submitted the proposals of the petitioner No. 2 seeking approval of their appointments. Said proposals have been rejected on account of various deficiencies in the proposals.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that since the proposals were submitted by the Administrator, several deficiencies cropped up therein. He submits that an opportunity be granted to the petitioners for submission of revised proposals through the Principals/Head Masters of the respective colleges/schools so that complete proposals with all documents can be put up before the respondent No. 1 for his consideration. Even today there appear to be disputes in the management, which are pending before the Joint Charity Commissioner in Application No. 11 of 2020. On this count, he submits that the revised proposals be submitted through the Principals/Head Masters of the respective colleges/schools and not through either groups of the management.

4. Accordingly, we dispose of the present petitions granting liberty to the Principals/Head Masters of the respective colleges/schools to submit revised proposals seeking approval to the appointments of the Petitioner Nos. 2 in all writ petitions

within a period of four (04) weeks from today. It is made clear that no member of either group of management would be a to said proposals. Even during the course of hearing before the respondent No. 1, no member of either of the groups of management would participate in such hearing and only Principals/Head Masters would be heard by the respondent No. 1. It is also clarified that this order shall not be cited by either of the rival groups before the Joint Charity Commissioner to claim control over the management.

5. If such proposals are submitted by the Principals/Head Masters of the respective colleges/schools to the respondent No. 1 within time specified above, Respondent No. 1 shall consider the same on their own merits and shall decide the same within a period of four (04) weeks thereafter. We clarify that we have not decided correctness of the reasons of rejection recorded while rejecting the proposals on earlier occasion. It would be open for the respondent No. 1 to consider said reasons once again, if they still subsist, while reconsideration of the proposals. Writ Petitions are accordingly disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

[SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.]

[MANGESH S. PATIL, J.]

bsb/Sept. 22