



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

934 WRIT PETITION NO. 9947 OF 2024

YEDSHIKAR NAVED YUSUF
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH
ITS PRINCIPAL SECRETARY AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for petitioner : Mr. T.M. Venjane
AGP for the respondent – State : Mr. V.M. Chate
...

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

DATE : 10 SEPTEMBER 2024

ORAL ORDER (MANGESH S. PATIL, J.) :

Heard.

2. The petitioner's proposal for including his name in Shalaarth Pranali for disbursement of salary has been rejected by the impugned communication only on the ground that he being an appointee after 13-02-2013, he ought to have cleared TET but has not done so.

3. The issue regarding mandatory nature of the TET qualification to the employees of a minority institute, is subjudice before the Supreme Court. Till the finality is reached by way of decision in those matters, the petitioner's name deserves to be included subject to

the usual rider of his furnishing an undertaking foregoing all the benefits depending upon the decision of the Supreme Court.

4. The writ petition is allowed partly.

5. The matter is remitted back to the respondent – Deputy Director of Education for passing orders for including petitioner's name in the Shalaarth Pranali subject to his furnishing undertaking before this Court foregoing all the benefits without demur, in case the Supreme Court decides that the TET is mandatory, and furnishing its copy before the Deputy Director of Education.

[SHAILESH P. BRAHME]
JUDGE

[MANGESH S. PATIL]
JUDGE

arp/