

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

4 WRIT PETITION NO.11251 OF 2022

HARICHANDRA VYAMSHALA V KRIDA MANDAL CHARHATA
THROUGH ITS PRESIDENT ANJU SAHEBRAO KARANJKAR
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA,
THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. S. S. Thombre.
AGP for Respondent/State: Mr. S. K. Tambe.
...

CORAM : **RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
SANJAY A. DESHMUKH, JJ.**

DATE : 14th November, 2022.

P.C.:

1. The petitioner has put forth prayer clauses 'B' and 'C' as under :-

“(B) By issuing a writ of mandamus, orders, directions or any other appropriate writ in the like nature, direct the respondent No.2 to decide the proposal to grant renewal Certificate of Registration to the child care home run by the petitioner society at Beed, Tq. & District Beed, which is pending since 2018, and for that purpose, issue necessary orders;

(C) Pending hearing and final disposal of this writ petition, direct the respondent No.3 to permit/allow the inmates of the child care home run by petitioner society for further studies, by granting renewal of the Certificate Registration, in terms of the provisions of the Act of 2015, which granted earlier in favour of the child care home run by the petitioner society;”

2. The coordinate Bench (Coram : Mangesh S. Patil and Sandeep V. Marne, JJ.) vide the judgment dated 08.09.2022 delivered in Writ Petition No.7821/2021 filed by the Mother Teresa Balakashram Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others and in connected matters, has quashed and set aside the impugned communication dated 17.08.2021.

3. The learned advocate for the petitioner as well as the learned AGP agree that this petition has to be disposed off in the light of the judgment dated 08.09.2022. The pending proposal of the petitioner will have to undergo rectification of shortcomings and thereafter, the decision is to be taken.

4. In view of the above, this Writ Petition is disposed off.

5. Needless to state, respondent No.2 shall initiate steps to take a decision on the proposal of the petitioner and in the event of any shortcomings, he would grant time to the petitioner to rectify the shortcomings. After such rectification, the petitioner would approach respondent No.2 with the rectified proposal within four weeks and thereafter, respondent No.2 would take a final decision on the proposal within sixteen (16) weeks from today.

[SANJAY A. DESHMUKH, J.]

[RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.]