



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

51 WRIT PETITION NO. 1528 OF 2025

**JAY JAWAN JAY KISAN EDUCATION SOCIETY THROUGH ITS
SECRETARY**

VERSUS

**THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH PRINCIPAL ITS
SECRETARY AND OTHERS**

....

Mr. Abhishek D. Chapule, h/f Mr. N. P. Patil Jamalpurkar, Advocate
for the Petitioner

Mr. V. M. Kagne, AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 to 4 – State

....

**CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL &
Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.**

DATE : 05.05.2025

ORAL ORDER (Mangesh S. Patil, J.) :-

. We have heard both the sides.

2. Rule. Rule is made returnable forthwith.

3. At the joint request of the parties, the matter is being
disposed of at the stage of the admission.

4. The petitioner institution has been running a child
care home under the provisions of the Juvenile Justice (Care and
Protection of Children) Act, 2000.

5. The application seeking registration/renewal under Section 41 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, was stated to be pending with the respondent authorities and the petition has been filed soliciting a direction for grant of permission/registration under the aforementioned provision.

6. Respondent Nos. 1 to 4, in their affidavit-in-reply *inter alia* have mentioned that the permission solicited by the petitioner, has already been rejected long back in the year 2019 for variety of deficiencies as noted in paragraph No.8 of the affidavit-in-reply.

7. After hearing both the sides, without entering into the controversy as to if the petitioner had cured the defects, whether it was extended any opportunity of being heard and as to whether even opportunity was extended to cure the defects, as this court has been consistently followed a course as indicated in the directions in the matter of ***Mother Teresa Balakashram Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others; (Writ Petition No.7821 of 2021)*** and connected matters, disposed of vide order dated 08.09.2022, even this writ petition is disposed of by quashing and setting aside the decision of

the respondent rejecting the petitioner's proposal and further directing the petitioner to submit a fresh proposal by ensuring that all the defects pointed out in paragraph No.8 are cured. If any such proposal is submitted within four weeks, it shall be processed by the respondents in accordance with law and in accordance with the directions contained in the case of ***Mother Teresa Balakshram***, on its own merits.

8. Needless to state that if any further deficiencies are noted, an opportunity shall be extended at every such occasion, to the petitioner to cure that defects.

[Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J.]

[MANGESH S. PATIL, J.]

SMS