

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 8388 OF 2024

Parveen Dawood Chilwan And Ors

...Petitioners

Versus

The Education Officer (Sec) Raigad Zilla
Parishad Alibag And Ors.

...Respondents

Mr. I. M. Khairdi for the Petitioners.

Mr. V. G. Badgujar, AGP for the Respondent-State.

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

DATED : 18 JUNE 2024

P.C.:

. Heard learned counsel for the parties. At the outset, learned counsel for the Petitioner seeks leave to delete 3rd line in para 6 of the petition starting with “It is submitted that 2 teachers ...” and ending at “... dated 20/11/2018.” In view of the order that we propose to pass, there is no need to carry out amendment. We have noted the request.

2. Petitioner No. 1 Employee working with Petitioner No. 2 School run by Petitioner No. 3 Education Institute are jointly challenging the Order dated 13 February 2024 passed by Respondent No. 1 / Education Officer (Secondary), Zilla Parishad, Alibag. By said impugned Order, the

approval for appointment of Petitioner No. 1 as Shikshan Sevak is rejected.

3. It is submitted that the impugned order is passed without any show cause notice and had an opportunity been given, the Petitioners would have given appropriate and necessary explanation to reasons stated in impugned order for rejecting proposal.

4. Perused the impugned Order. It 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 13 February 2024 will be treated as notice to Petitioners of the proposed ground/s for rejection of Petitioner No. 1's proposal, which stands restored. If there are any other grounds on which the Respondent Education Officer intends to return or reject the proposal, he is directed to communicate the same to the Petitioners within a period of 3 weeks from today.

6. The Petitioners shall thereafter submit its explanation to the proposed grounds, 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 of

Petitioner No. 1 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. The order will be passed keeping in mind the directions issued by this Court in Part II Clause A(i) to (iii) of Judgment dated 16 April 2024 in the matter of Nitin B. Tadge Vs. State of Maharashtra in Writ Petition No. 204 of 2019 and other companion petitions.

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 proposal as prayed, consequent benefits and orders will follow, and in that case, 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.)