

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

**WRIT PETITION NO. 6990 OF 2022
WITH CIVIL APPLICATION NO.13693 OF 2023**

**VIJAY BHAUSAHEB GAVANDE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
UNION OF INDIA AND OTHERS**

....

Mr. S. B. Ghatol Patil, Advocate for Petitioners
Mr. P. S. Patil, AGP for Respondent – State
Mr. P. D. Suryawanshi, Advocate for Respondent No.6

....

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE AND
Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.**

DATE : 07.11.2023

PER COURT :-

1. The learned Advocate for the Petitioners submits that all the Petitioners have passed the TET, after the cut off date 31.03.2019.

2. This Court has delivered a judgment dated 11.06.2021 in Writ Petition No.4904 of 2020 (Sagar Gopichand Bahire Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others) and a group of Petitions wherein this Court concluded that candidates without TET or those who

have not passed the TET prior to 31.03.2019, cannot be retained in service. Status-quo was directed to be maintained to enable the aggrieved parties to approach the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

3. In Special Leave to Appeal (Civil) No. 8300 of 2021 (Priti Ravindra Warghante and others Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others) and a group of Petitions, the Hon'ble Supreme Court continued the status-quo.

4. The coordinate Bench of this Court, has passed an order dated 10.08.2023 in Writ Petition No.9944 of 2023. Paragraph Nos. 1 to 4 of the said order read as under:-

“1. The petitioner is challenging the order passed by the respondent no.4/Education Officer (Secondary), Aurangabad, refusing to grant permission for including his name in the online portal for disbursement of salary on the ground that he had not passed Teacher Eligibility Test examination (T.E.T.) as per the Government decision dated 13.02.2013.

2. It is common knowledge that the subject pertaining to the T.E.T. qualification is already sub-judice before the Supreme Court which has directed status-quo to be maintained.

3. In the light of above, we quash and set aside the impugned order, direct the respondent no.4 to pass order afresh, which shall not be by resorting to the ground which has been mentioned in the impugned communication.

4. *The decision shall be taken as expeditiously as possible and in any case within six weeks. This order shall be subject to the final outcome of the matter before the Supreme Court.”*

5. Nevertheless, the predicament before us is, as to how far these Petitioners can survive with meager salaries or no salary at all, only on the ground that they are not TET qualified. This Court concluded that TET under the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009 (for short ‘the 2009 Act’) is mandatory. The Hon’ble Supreme Court would now decide the issue. Until then, all the teachers are protected and the status-quo in their employment is maintained.

6. There are cases, wherein the teachers before us contend that the Management did not pay them at all and they are working without salaries. Unless their names are included in the ‘Shalarth Pranali’, they are not entitled for salary though the grants may be available.

7. The learned A.G.P. has strenuously opposed this petition, contending that such petitions are likely to open a pandora’s box. These teachers, who are not TET qualified, would be approaching this Court for seeking orders for entering their names in the ‘Shalarth Pranali’. They would draw salaries scales as are available through the

salary grants extended by the Government, which are available only to those teachers, who have requisite qualification. He raises a dispute of salary grants to the teachers, who do not have requisite qualification. He reminds us of the judgment delivered by this Court in Sagar Gopichand Bahire (*supra*), wherein this Court has finally concluded that, the teachers without TET need to be terminated. He further submits that, since the Hon'ble Supreme Court had directed status-quo to be maintained, it would not mean that, further service benefits can be granted to the teachers, who do not have the TET qualification.

8. This is a Court of equity and while passing orders, this Court has to balance the equities. If the interest of the teachers are to be protected by passing a conditional or a qualified order, the interest of the State Government, which extends the salary grants also has to take into account, as the State Government insists that their salary grants should not be utilized for payment of salaries to those teachers, who do not have requisite qualification.

9. In the light of the peculiar circumstances as noted above, we find that, it would be appropriate to bind the Petitioners with an undertaking that, they would abide by the decision of the Hon'ble

Supreme Court, and if it is concluded by the Hon'ble Supreme Court that, they cannot be continued in employment, they would suffer the consequences. By filing such undertaking the equities would be balanced while passing an order granting them the salaries by allotment of 'Shalarth-ID'. Needless to state that, if the Hon'ble Supreme Court concludes that the TET is mandatory, such teachers will then have to be removed from employment.

10. In view of the above, **this Writ Petition is partly allowed.** The impugned orders are quashed and set aside and we further direct as under:-

(a) The Petitioners would tender an undertaking that, they would abide by the conclusions that would be drawn by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, and if the verdict is adverse to those teachers who do not have the TET qualification or have cleared the TET after 31/03/2019, or as the case may be, they would abide by the same without raising any cause of action.

(b) Let such affidavit undertaking be filed in this Court within 15 days from today and a copy be tendered to the concerned Education Officer within the same timeline.

(c) Considering the above, the proposals of the Petitioners would be considered for entering their names in the 'Shalarth-ID' on their own merits, save and except, the reason that they

are not TET qualified. Needless to state, the proposals would be decided within 30 days after the submissions of the undertakings.

(d) If an adverse order is passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court by which the teachers are covered by clause (a), the State Government would not recover the salaries already paid to them, since they have worked for those tenures and they have earned their salaries for performing their duties.

(e) In the event, the candidates like the Petitioners are protected by the Hon'ble Supreme Court's conclusions and they are held to be qualified to continue in employment, they would be entitled for all service benefits like promotions, increments, etc.

11. In view of the above, **the Civil Application** would not survive and **stands disposed off**.

[Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J.]

[RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.]

SMS