

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 7625 OF 2021
WITH WP/7646/2021

SANDEEP RATNAKAR JONDDHALE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THR ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...

Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. S.T. Shelke
AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 & 2 : Mr. P.G. Borade
Advocate for Respondent No. 3 : Mr. P.B. Shirsath

...

**CORAM : C.V. BHADANG &
SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, JJ.**

DATE : 13 JUNE, 2022.

ORDER :-

Heard. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. Learned counsel for the respondents waive notice. Heard finally by consent of parties.

2. This petition can be disposed of on a short count. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 25.3.2021 passed by respondent No.2 thereby refusing approval to the appointment of petitioner on account of certain shortcomings in the proposal sent by the management. Perusal of the order dated 25.3.2021 reveals that on account of certain compliance, the Education Officer has refused to

grant approval.

3. We have heard the learned counsel for the parties. It transpired during the course of arguments that no opportunity was given to the management to rectify the said irregularities. In such circumstances, we find that the Education Officer can give opportunity to the respondent No.3 to rectify the defects and thereafter, the respondent No.2 can pass appropriate order, in accordance with law.

4. In that view of the matter, petition is allowed. Impugned order is hereby set aside. The respondent No.2 to give opportunity to the respondent No.3 to comply with the objections and to rectify the shortcomings and thereafter, pass appropriate order, in accordance with law at the earliest.

5. Rule is made absolute in the aforesaid terms with no order as to costs.

SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.

C.V. BHADANG, J.

grt/-