



(1)

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

944 WRIT PETITION NO. 1696 OF 2025

SMT. TRUPTI VIKRAM ANDHARE

VERSUS

1. THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY, SCHOOL EDUCATION DEPTT., MUMBAI
2. DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION (ADMINISTRATION), PUNE
3. DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION, LATUR
4. EDUCATION OFFICER (SECONDARY), ZILLA PARISHAD, LATUR
5. CASTRIBE SHIKSHAK SANGHATANA, LATUR

....

Mr S. S. Thombre, Advocate for petitioner

Mr M. M. Nerlikar, A.G.P. for respondent Nos.1 to 4/State

CORAM : MANGESH S. PATIL

AND

PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, JJ.

DATE : 5th February, 2025

PER COURT:

1. We have heard the learned advocate for the petitioner and perused the papers.

2. The petitioner is coming with following prayers :-

“B) By issuing a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate order or directions in the like nature, direct Respondent No.3 to withdraw the inquiry proceedings sought to be initiated against the petitioner pursuant to the complaint/s made by Respondent No.5-Association;

(C) By issuing a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate order or directions in the like nature, direct the Respondents authorities not to entertain false, frivolous and frequent complaints made by Respondent No.5 against the petitioner;

(2)

(D) By issuing a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate order or directions in the like nature, the necessary action may kindly be initiated against the respondent No.5 making false complaints against the petitioner and for that purpose, issue necessary orders;

(E) Pending hearing and final disposal of this writ petition, the further proceedings in inquiry sought to be initiated against the petitioner by Respondent No.3 pursuant to the complaints made by the Respondent No.5-Association may kindly be stayed; and for that purpose issue necessary orders;”

3. The learned advocate for the petitioner takes us through the papers to demonstrate that the department is hell-bent somehow in persecuting the petitioner at the instance of respondent No.5/Union, which has no locus as far as functioning of public office which the petitioner was holding as the Education Officer (Secondary). He adverts our attention even to the consistent stand of this Court in stalling such persecutions at the instance of strangers. He would advert our attention to the order passed by this Court in Writ Petition No.1556/2024 dated 08/02/2024, whereby respondent No.3 therein which the same respondent No.3 Deputy Director of Education, Latur was directed not to proceed with the proposed disciplinary action and directed status quo as on the date of the order to be maintained.

4. The learned advocate for the petitioner submits that, in spite of such a direction of this Court in the earlier round, again

(3)

something is being entertained against the petitioner and at the instance of respondent No.5/Union. He points out that, the issue has been taken even to the *Vidhan Sabha* and Deputy Director of Education, Chhatrapati Sambhajinagar, by communication dated 20/11/2024, addressed to respondent No.3/Deputy Director of Education, Latur has called upon him to take appropriate steps in the light of the representation made by respondent No.5, dated 08/11/2024.

5. Admittedly, the petitioner is no longer holding the same post of Education Officer (Secondary). There is nothing before us to demonstrate that she has even been called upon to respond to any representation/application, much less, calling upon her response to any allegation. The petitioner would have right to raise a grievance and agitate if and when she is called upon pursuant to this communication (Exhibit 'E') to respond. Keeping that issue open and with liberty to the petitioner, there being no extant cause, the writ petition is disposed of.

(PRAFULLA S. KHUBALKAR, J.)
sjk

(MANGESH S. PATIL, J.)