

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 505 OF 2024

Vandana Vijaykumar Nimbale

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Ors..

...Respondents

.....

Mr. Umesh Pawar, for the Petitioner.

Ms. R.A. Salunkhe AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 to 5.

Mr.Prashant Bhavake, for Respondent Nos. 6 and 7.

.....

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

DATE : 18 JANUARY 2024

P.C.:

. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Petitioner/Employee, working as Librarian with Respondent No. 7 School run by Respondent No. 6 Management, is challenging the Order dated 5 May 2022 passed by Respondent No. 5 / Education Officer (Secondary), Zilla Parishad, Sangli. By said impugned Order, the individual approval for appointment of the Petitioner is refused. Learned counsel for the Respondent Nos. 6 & 7 / Management states that they are supporting the cause of the Petitioner. We proceed on the basis of said statement.

3. It is urged that had an opportunity been given, the Petitioner and Respondent Management would have given appropriate and necessary explanation to reason of rejection.

4. Matters like these in large numbers are taking Court's time. This is yet another case, requiring an inquiry about the grounds of rejection, to be done first time in this Court. This is because the Respondent Education Officer has passed order without indicating in advance its grounds of rejection.

5. In that view of the matter, we dispose of this petition by directing that the impugned order dated 5 May 2022 will be treated as notice to Respondent / Educational Institute of the proposed grounds of rejection. The Petitioner's 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 Respondent/Educational Institute within a period of 3 weeks from today.

6. The Respondent Educational Institute shall thereafter submit its explanation to the proposed grounds of rejection, along with supporting material, GRs, 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 Petitioner's proposal and the same shall be decided on its own merits in accordance with law. Needless to mention that if the Respondent-Education Officer decides to grant approval as sought and to issue Shalarth ID, 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.)