



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

948 WRIT PETITION NO.7874 OF 2023

KAVITA SHESHERAO SANGVIKAR

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

...

Mr. K. P. Rodge, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mrs. M. N. Ghanekar, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 and 2 – State.

Mr. V. P. Kadam, Advocate for Respondent Nos.4 and 5.

Mr. N. S. Kadam, Advocate for Respondent No.3.

...

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND
S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 19th APRIL, 2024.

ORDER :-

. After hearing learned Advocate for the petitioner, we could see that the main relief is asked against respondent Nos.4 and 5 i.e. Management, for which writ of mandamus cannot be issued. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had made several representations to respondent No.5 and the copy of the same was given to respondent No.3, however, it appears that no action has been taken.

2. Taken into consideration the said communication, in fact, the representation ought to have been directly addressed to respondent No.3 so that he might have thought of taking any action which is

permissible.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner then, on instructions, seeks withdrawal of the petition to make appropriate representation to respondent No.3.

4. In view of the said statement, the writ petition stands disposed of as withdrawn with liberty to the petitioner to make appropriate representation to respondent No.3 and if such representation is received, respondent No.3 to take decision on its own merits within a period of 15 days from the date of receipt of such representation.

[S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm