

3. The learned Counsel for the Petitioners states that the Petitioners have explanation for all the grounds stated in the impugned order and had an opportunity been given, the Petitioners would have explained the position to the Education Officer. We find

this grievance to be correct. Such approach needlessly increases the burden on this Court and substantial judicial time is wasted as by filing the reply, the Education Officer for the first time would deal with the grounds raised in the petition thereby calling this Court to adjudicate the issue at the first instance.

4. Therefore, we dispose of the writ petition directing that the order dated 29 January 2023 passed by Respondent No.1- the Education Officer (Secondary) shall be treated as a notice to Petitioner Nos. 2 and 3 of the proposed grounds for rejection and calling upon the Petitioners to submit their explanation. The proposal of the Petitioners stand restored to file. The Petitioners will submit their explanation to the grounds stated in the impugned order dated 29 January 2023 which is directed to be treated as notice. The Petitioners shall do so within a period of four weeks from today. If the Petitioners intend to rely upon any decision of the Court, the Petitioners will annex the same to the reply. Thereupon, the Education Officer will deal with the explanation given by the Petitioners and pass a reasoned order as per law within a period of eight weeks thereafter, subject to earlier time bound commitments, if the Education Officer intends to reject the proposal.

5. With these observations, the writ petition is disposed of.

(M.M.SATHAYE, J.)

(NITIN JAMDAR, J.)