

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 16615 OF 2023

Shree Danamma Devi Educational Trust
Guddapur Through Its President And Ors. ...Petitioners

Versus

State Of Maharashtra And Anr. ...Respondents

.....

Mr. Rahul S. Kadam, Advocate for Petitioners.

Mr. V.M. Mali, AGP, for State/Respondent.

.....

HUSENBASHA
RAHAMAN
NADAF
Digitally signed
by HUSENBASHA
RAHAMAN
NADAF
Date: 2024.01.12
15:01:30 +0530

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

DATE : 8 JANUARY 2024

P.C.:

. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The Petitioner Nos. 1 & 2 - Educational Institute / Management alongwith Petitioner No. 3 – employee have jointly filed this petition challenging the order dated 03 January 2023 by Respondent No. 2 /Education Officer rejecting the approval for appointment of Petitioner No. 3 as a junior clerk.

3. The learned counsel for the Petitioners submitted that the impugned order is passed without giving any opportunity to the

Educational Institute to submit explanation to the ground/s on which the proposal is rejected.

4. Indeed, we find in many such matters that the proposals are rejected without communicating the grounds for rejection and we also find that had the Educational Institute been given an opportunity, it would have given explanation dealing with the grounds of rejection. This method adopted by Education Officer of directly rejecting the proposals, without informing proposed grounds of rejection, is giving rise to flood of litigation which takes precious judicial time of this Court because an inquiry about the grounds of rejection is required to be done in this Court at the first instance.

5. In that view of the matter, we dispose of this petition by directing that the impugned order dated 03 January 2023 will be treated as notice to Educational Institute of the proposed ground/s of rejection. The Petitioners' proposal stands 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 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 and case laws/orders of this Court, if relied upon. The Respondent / Education Officer is directed to decide the proposal 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 within a period of 8 weeks from the receipt of explanation from the Educational Institute, subject to other time bound directions and pressing public duty, if any.

7. We have not expressed any opinion on the merits of 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, 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.)