



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 9391 OF 2024

Manjusha Punjaji Chendke .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others .. Respondents

Shri Umakant B. Deshmukh, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Shri S. R. Yadav Lonikar, A.G.P. for the Respondent No.
Shri S. B. Ghule, Advocate for the Respondent No. 3.

**CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL AND
SHAILESH P. BRAHME, JJ.
DATE : 30 AUGUST 2024.**

FINAL ORDER :

. Heard. Issue notice to the respondents for final disposal.
The learned A. G. P. waives service for the respondent/State. Mr.
Ghule, waives service for the respondent No. 3.

2. In spite of petitioner's appointment has been duly approved
by the Education Officer, by the impugned communication, his
request for including his name in the Shalarth Pranali for
disbursement of the salary has been rejected on the ground that
appointment being of period after 20.06.2018 and it was not
through the Pavitra Partal.

3. We have time and again and consistently holding that since
it is a matter of disbursement of salary, once there has been approval

to the appointment it would not lie before the Deputy Director to refuse permission for including the name in the Shalarth Pranali by resorting to an enquiry into the approval granted to the appointment.

4. The impugned order is quashed and set aside. The matter is remanded back to the respondent/Deputy Director of Education, who shall take appropriate decision on its own merits for granting permission for including petitioner's name in Shalarth Pranali. However, it shall not be rejected on the grounds mentioned in the impugned communication or on the ground that the appointment of the petitioner was not through Pavitral Portal. The decision shall be taken within a period of four (04) weeks from today.

[SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.] [MANGESH S. PATIL, J.]

bsb/Aug. 24