



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**13 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 336 OF 2025
IN WP/5020/2023**

THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER ZILLA PARISHAD AHMEDNAGAR

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND ANOTHER

Mr.S.B. Parnere, Advocate for the applicant.

Mr.P.D. Patil, AGP for the respondent-State.

Mr.A.B. Kale, Advocate for the ori. petitioner.

CORAM : KISHORE C. SANT, J.

DATE : 13.01.2025

PC :-

01. By way of this application, the applicant seeks modification of order passed by this court on 18.12.2024 and for refund of amount of costs directed to be deposited in this Court of Rs.10,000/-. In the application, it is stated that the petitioner was suspended when he was working at school, where boys and girls were taking education. There are complainants against the petitioner under section 354, 354/A, 354/B of the Indian Penal Code and also under section 12 of the POCSO Act. Complainants are also filed under section 3(i)(q)(i)(ii) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act. It is stated that in view of above position, it is not desirable to reinstate the petitioner in the same school. The applicant is proposing to reinstate the petitioner only in boys' school. He has given names of five schools, where he can be reinstated.

02. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that out of five

schools distance of school at Puntamba is accessible. Other four schools are at a distance of more than 100 kms.

03. Considering above, the order is modified to the extent of allowing reinstatement of the petitioner to the boys school at Puntamba. The reinstatement be done within one week from today.

04. So far as refund of costs is concerned, this Court finds that the earlier order speaks for itself. The costs was imposed for not filing reply for more than one year. Though the petitioner was under suspension and still no information was given to the lawyer by the respondent - Zilla Parishad, the costs was imposed for that reason. This Court finds no reason to recall order to that extent.

05. The civil application is disposed off in above terms.

[KISHORE C. SANT, J.]