



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.5878 OF 2024

Kishor s/o Pandurang Raut

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through its Principal Secretary,
School Education & Sports Department,
Mantralay, Mumbai-32.
2. The Director of Education,
Secondary and Higher Secondary,
Directorate of Education,
Central Building, Pune-411001.
3. The Deputy Director of Education,
Aurangabad Division,
Aurangabad (Chha. Sambhajinar).
4. The Education Officer (Secondary),
Zilla Parishad, Beed, Tq. & Dist. Beed.
5. Sant Khanduji Baba Vidyalay, Saidapur,
Tq. Georai & Dist. Beed,
through its Head Master.

... RESPONDENTS

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Savant Vilas P
AGP for Respondents: Mr. D.R. Korde

...

CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL &
SHAILESH P. BRAHME, JJ.

DATE : 20.06.2024

PER COURT:

The petitioner's proposal for including his name in the online portal for disbursement of salary popularly known as 'Shalarth Pranali'

was initially turned down by the Education Department by quoting certain reasons by pointing out the shortcomings in the proposal.

2. It is now being pointed out that subsequently a fresh proposal duly complied with has been forwarded by the Management and the Education Officer (Secondary) in turn has forwarded it to the Deputy Director of Education vide communication dated 05.01.2024. The writ petition can be disposed of by directing the respondent – Deputy Director of Education to take appropriate decision in the light of this proposal. However, it is being pointed out that one of the reasons for not directing inclusion of petitioner's name in the online portal that has been consistently mentioned is that petitioner's appointment is of 15.01.2015 and he has not cleared the T.E.T. This Court in several matters *inter alia* in the matter of **Dattatray Devidas Sonwale and Anr. Vs. The State of Maharashtra and Ors.; (Writ Petition No.11121/2023)**, by the order dated 07.09.2023 which in turn referred to the earlier decision and on the ground that the issue regarding T.E.T. qualification has been pending before the Supreme Court, had directed the name of that petitioner to be included in the Shalarth Pranali subject to furnishing certain undertaking. It would be advisable for the Deputy Director of Education even to consider this aspect and the observations of this Court to the extent of the issue regarding T.E.T. in respect of the petitioner while taking decision in accordance with the directions of this Court.

3. The writ petition is disposed of by directing the respondent

No.3 to take appropriate decision on the proposal dated 05.01.2024 received by his office from the Education Officer (Secondary) Zilla Parishad, Beed as expeditiously as possible and in any case within six weeks on its own merits and in the light of the observations made herein above.

(SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.)

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)

habeeb