

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

Writ Petition No. 116 of 2016

Shri Bhise Manohar Pandurang	...	Petitioner
v/s.		
The State of Maharashtra & ors.	...	Respondents

Mr. S.P. Sarnath i/b Mr. Pankaj Deokar for the Petitioner.
Mrs. P.J.Gavhane, AGP for respondents 4 & 3 – State.
Mr. Milind Deshmukh for respondents 5 to 7.

**CORAM : SUNIL B.SHUKRE &
AMIT BORKAR, JJ.**

16th February 2022

P.C.

Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard finally by consent of the parties.

2. The contention is that the University had already granted its no objection for sanctioning one post of lecturer in Logic on full time basis by consolidating the work load available in two different colleges in the same subject run by the same management and, therefore, the Government could not have rejected the proposal of the management i.e. Respondent Nos.5,6 & 7 for sanctioning such a post.

3. No doubt, it is true that the University had given its no objection in the matter and it is also true that the proposal in this regard was sent by the management to the Joint Director but when the proposal was forwarded to the State Government by the Joint Director through Director, Higher Education, Pune, the Respondent No.1 on its due consideration rejected the proposal.

4. Such rejection of the proposal which took place on 25th March 2015 (impugned communication) has been accepted by Respondent Nos.5,6 & 7 which is evident from the fact that it was not challenged by them. There is nothing on record which would show that the rejection of the proposal has been questioned by these Respondents.

5. When the rejection of the proposal has been accepted by the Respondent Nos.5,6 and 7, we do not think that the petitioner would have any *locus standi* in the matter.

6. Even otherwise, whether to sanction the post of full time lecturer by clubbing together work load available in two different colleges or not is a matter of policy and unless it is shown that the policy decision is arbitrary or in violation of some law or rules or is unreasonable, the policy decision cannot be judicially reviewed under extraordinary writ jurisdiction by this Court.

7. In the result, we find no merit in the Petition. The Petition stands dismissed. No costs.

(AMIT BORKAR,J)

(SUNIL B.SHUKRE,J)

Lata Panjwani, P.S.