



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

902 WRIT PETITION NO. 12542 OF 2023

1. Molana Abul Kalam Azad
Charitable Trust Through its
President Shaikh Ali Shabir
2. Sayyed Ahmad Sayyed Masood Inamdar
3. Smt. Shaikh Taslim d/o Salim .. Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra
Through its Secretary
School Ecuation and Sports Department
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
2. The Deputy Directors of Education,
Latur Division, Latur.
3. The Education Officer
Zilla Parishad (Primary),
Graduate Osmanabad. .. Respondents

...

Ms. Fatema Kazi h/f Mr. S. S. Kazi, Advocate for the Petitioners.
Mr. K. S. Patil, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 and 2 – State.
Mr. Mr. Abhijeet Choudhari h/f Mr. B. B. Bhise, Advocate for Respondent No.3

...

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

DATE : 27 JUNE 2024

ORDER :-

Petitioner Nos.2 and 3, who have been serving as teachers with petitioner No.1 Management, are aggrieved by the fact that in spite of the proposal being pending with the respondent No.3 Education Officer for

including their names in the online portal for disbursement of salary, no decision has been taken and they have been orally told that for want of their clearing TET, their names have not been included.

2. As can be gathered, no decision has been taken much less communicated to the petitioners although the proposals is pending with the respondent No.3 Education Officer apparently since the year 2023.

3. It would be appropriate to direct the respondent No.3 – Education Officer to take appropriate decision on the proposal in accordance with law and particularly, the law laid down in the decisions in the matters of **Mohini Mohan Bhandwale Vs. State of Maharashtra and others, (2021 SCC OnLine Bom. 5709)** and **Dattatray Appasaheb Patil Vs. The State of Maharashtra and Others, (2021 SCC OnLine Bombay 5881]**.

4. Writ Petition is disposed of by directing respondent No.3 Education Officer (Primary) to pass appropriate order on the petitioners' proposals, as expeditiously as possible and in any case, within a period of four weeks.

5. If the proposal is not traceable with the office of respondent No.3, he shall immediately communicate it to the petitioners, whereupon the petitioner No.1 shall submit a fresh proposal, which shall be decided again within four weeks from the receipt of that proposal.

[**SHAILESH P. BRAHME**]
JUDGE

[**MANGESH S. PATIL**]
JUDGE

scm