

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 185 OF 2024

Amal Vidya Vardhini Thr Its President
And Ors.

...Petitioners

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra Thr The
Secretary And Ors.

...Respondents

SNEHA
NITIN
CHAVAN

Digitally signed
by SNEHA NITIN
CHAVAN
Date: 2024.01.22
17:41:37 +0530

Mr. Prashant Bhavake for the Petitioners.
Mr. M.M. Pabale, AGP for the Respondents/State.

CORAM : NITIN JAMDAR AND
M.M.SATHAYE, JJ.

DATE : 16 JANUARY 2024

P.C. :

. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Petitioner No. 1 Management, Petitioner No. 2 – School and Petitioner No. 3 Employee are jointly challenging the Order dated 2 December 2022 passed by Respondent No. 5 / Education Officer, Zilla Parishad, Ratnagiri. By said impugned Order, proposal seeking individual approval to appointment of Petitioner No. 3 on aided post of *Shikshan Sevak* is rejected.

3. It is submitted that, had an opportunity been given, the

Petitioners would have given appropriate and necessary explanations to reasons of rejection.

4. This is yet another matter, in which Education Officer has directly rejected the proposal, without informing proposed grounds of rejection. This has resulted in a situation where inquiry about the grounds of rejection are required to be done first time in this Court.

5. In that view of the matter, we dispose of this petition by directing that the impugned order dated 2 December 2022 will be treated as notice to Petitioner Educational Institute of the proposed grounds of rejection. The Petitioners' proposal stand restored. If there are any other grounds on which the Education Officer intends to reject the proposal, he is directed to communicate the same to the Petitioner Educational Institute within a period of 3 weeks from today.

6. The Educational Institute shall thereafter submit its explanation to the proposed grounds of rejection, along with supporting material including Government Resolutions, case laws / orders of this Court etc. if relied upon. The Respondent / Education Officer is directed to decide the proposal thereafter within a period of 8 weeks, by dealing with the explanation given by the Educational Institute as also dealing with case law/orders of this Court, by passing a reasoned order, subject to other time bound directions.

7. We have not expressed any opinion on the Petitioners' proposal and the same shall be decided on its own merits in accordance with law. Needless to mention that if the Respondent/Education Officer proceeds to grant approval as sought, the aforesaid procedure/directions will not apply.

8. The writ petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

(M.M.SATHAYE, J.)

(NITIN JAMDAR, J.)