

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 10748 OF 2024

Lavhaji Vasant Jagtap

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Ors.

...Respondents

Mr. Prabhakar M. Jadhav, for Petitioner.

Mr. S.H. Kankal, AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 to 3.

Mr. Shankar V. Mane, for Respondent Nos. 4 and 5.

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

DATE : 5 AUGUST 2024

P.C.:

. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Petitioner/ employee working with Respondent No. 5 School run by Respondent No. 4 Educational Institute, is challenging the order dated 19 October 2023 passed by Respondent No. 3 / Education Officer (Secondary), Zilla Parishad, Sangli. By said impugned Order, the earlier order dated 8 February 2023 returning / rejecting approval to Petitioner's appointment as Shikshan Sevak is confirmed. Learned counsel for the Respondent No. 4 & 5 states that there is no internal dispute in the Management and they are supporting the cause of the Petitioner.

3. Perused the impugned orders. By earlier order/communication, shortfalls were communicated and by later order, the earlier

HUSENBASHA
RAHAMAN
NADAF
Digitally signed
by HUSENBASHA
RAHAMAN
NADAF
Date: 2024.08.06
18:16:34 +0530

order/communication is confirmed without any notice to or hearing the Petitioner / Respondent Management. Had an opportunity been given, the Petitioner / Respondent Management would have given appropriate and necessary explanation to reasons stated in impugned orders for rejecting/returning proposal. It has resulted in a situation where inquiry about the grounds of rejection are required to be done first time in this Court.

4. In that view of the matter, we dispose of this petition by directing that the impugned orders dated 19 October 2023 and 8 February 2023 will be treated as notice to Respondent / Educational Institute of the proposed ground/s for rejection of Petitioner'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 Respondent/Educational Institute within a period of three weeks from today.

5. The Respondent Educational Institute 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 thereafter within a period of eight 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.

6. 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 proceeds to grant proposal as prayed, consequent benefits and orders will follow, and in that case, the aforesaid procedure/directions will not apply.

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

(M.M. SATHAYE, J.)

(NITIN JAMDAR, J.)