

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

**WRIT PETITION NO. 18075 OF 2024**

Durga Education Society & Ors. ... Petitioners.  
Versus  
Education Officer Navi Mumbai  
Municipal Corporation Education  
Department & Ors. ... Respondents.

**WITH  
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 15585 OF 2024  
IN  
WRIT PETITION NO. 18075 OF 2024**

Satyendra Bhaiyalal Yadav. ... Petitioner.  
Versus  
Durga Education Society & Ors. ... Respondents.

**WITH  
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 15584 OF 2024  
IN  
WRIT PETITION NO. 18075 OF 2024**

Munna Yadav. ... Petitioner.  
Versus  
Durga Education Society & Ors. ... Respondents.

\*\*\*\*\*

Ms. Pooja G. Malik. for the Petitioner.  
Mr. Ravindra S. Panchundkar, for Respondent No. 1.  
Mr. A.R. Deolekar, AGP for Respondent Nos. 3 & 4/State.  
Ms. Aparna Devkar, for Interveners in IA/15585/2024 and  
IA/15584/2024.

\*\*\*\*\*

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE AND  
ASHWIN D. BHOBE, JJ.**

**DATE : 12<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER, 2024**

**P.C. :**

1. Petitioner No. 1 and Petitioner No. 3 have tendered two communications, both dated 12<sup>th</sup> December, 2024 addressed to the learned Advocate for the Petitioners, praying for leave to withdraw this Petition. The two communications under the signatures of the Petitioners along with their names, are taken on record and marked as **X-1** and **X-2** for identification. The Petitioner No. 3 on behalf of Petitioner Nos. 1 and 3, is present before the Court and is identified by the learned Advocate.

2. The learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the intervention Applicants submits that both these persons namely, Rajendraprasad Mahadev Yadav and Keshavmani Bagairam Yadav, have misrepresented before the Court. Neither of them is a President of the Institution nor Head Master of the School.

3. In view of the above, the **Writ Petition is dismissed as withdrawn on instructions.** No petition in the same cause, would be filed by these two Petitioners. In future, if any of these Petitioners approach this Court in a petition or as respondents, their locus would be

tested and if it is noticed that there is any misrepresentation, this Court would view the said conduct extremely seriously.

4. **Pending Interim Applications** do not survive and **are disposed off.**

**(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)**

**(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)**