



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 15596 OF 2023

SAVITA ANNASAHEB SURYAWANSHI

VERSUS

**THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY AND OTHERS**

....

Mr. T. M. Venjane, Advocate for Petitioner

Mr. P. S. Patil, AGP for Respondent – State

Mr. S. R. Dheple, Advocate for Respondent No.4

....

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

DATE : 20.12.2023

PER COURT :-

1. The Petitioner has passed the CTET after the cut off date 31.03.2019. His name does not figure in the TET scam. 20% grant-in-aid is available to the school. His salary as per the grants is not sanctioned since the Petitioner did not pass TET. The Petitioner refers to an order passed on 07.09.2023 in Writ Petition No.11121 of 2023 (Dattatry Devidas Sonwale and another Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others).

2. We have heard the learned Advocates for the respective sides. In **Dattatray (supra)**, we have observed in paragraph Nos. 3 to 10 (a to e), as under:-

“3. It is apparent that the judgment of this Court, dated 11/06/2021 in *Sagar Gopichand Bahire (supra)*, was not brought to the notice of the Co-ordinate Bench of this Court. Status-quo was ordered and the Hon’ble Supreme Court has continued the said order.

4. 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.

5. 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 through the grants may be available.

6. We quite appreciate the difficulties of these Petitioners, who either have to survive without salary or have to survive on a stipend. No doubt, the fault lies with these Petitioners, since they did not pass the TET and have created a problem for themselves. Nevertheless, as has been rightly canvassed by Shri. Venjane, the learned Advocate for the Petitioners that, the TET qualification is not mandatory, or will be mandatory only for those teachers who have been appointed after the introduction of the 2009 Act, which came

into operation on 01/04/2010. The orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court would be binding upon all.

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 order dated 11/08/2023 is quashed and set aside, with the following directions :-

(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.”

3. In view of the above, this **Petition is partly allowed.**

4. The impugned order dated 12.10.2023 is quashed and set aside to the extent of the petitioner, in terms of the directions set out in clauses (a) to (e) under paragraph 10 reproduced above.

[Y. G. KHOBRADE, J.]

[RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.]

SMS