



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.8100 OF 2024

Swati d/o Limbraj Nagrale

... PETITIONER

VERSUS

1. The State of Maharashtra,
through it's Principal Secretary,
Sports and Education Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
2. The Divisional Deputy Director of
Education Division Latur, Dist. Latur.
3. The Education Officer (Secondary)
Zilla Parishad, Latur
4. Lokayukta Shikshan Sanstha, Ahmedpur
through it's Secretary,
having official address as
Bhai Kisanrao Deshmukh College,
Chakur, Tq. Chakur, Dist. Latur
5. The Principal,
having official address as Bhai
Kisanrao Deshmukh College, Chakur,
Tq. Chakur, Dist. Latur

... RESPONDENTS

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Gadhe Ganesh Asaram
AGP for Respondents: Mr. S.P. Joshi

...

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

DATE : **01.08.2024**

ORDER (PER : SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.) :

Heard both the sides finally.

2. The petitioner is questioning the order dated 18.10.2023
passed by respondent No.2 – Deputy Director of Education rejecting the

proposal for seeking approval to the appointment of the petitioner.

3. The petitioner was appointed on 01.08.2017 with the respondent No.4 – College. The proposal was forwarded on 15.09.2023 to the respondent No.2. By the impugned order, it was rejected only on the ground that the procedure contemplated by Government Resolution dated 23.06.2017 was not followed. We have already taken view in the matter of **Shaikh Jaweria Khadarsab Vs. The State of Maharashtra; W.P No.13150/2022**, dated 10.06.2024 that the procedure for appointment through Pavitra Portal has not been put to desired use. The proposal cannot be rejected solely on the ground of non-compliance of the Government Resolution.

4. The respondent No.2 has not scrutinized the proposal objectively. In that view of the matter, writ petition is disposed of with the direction to respondent No.2 to reconsider the proposal, on its own merits, within a period of four weeks. However, he shall not rejected the same on the selfsame ground mentioned in the impugned communication. Impugned order is quashed.

(SHAILESH P. BRAHME, J.)

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)