



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

81 WRIT PETITION NO. 3619 OF 2025

DHANANJAY NANDKUMAR BANGALE

VERSUS

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

AND

83 WRIT PETITION NO. 3626 OF 2025

SUKESHINI DAYARAM KHADE

VERSUS

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

....

Mr. S. S. Thombre, Advocate for the Petitioners

Mr. M. K. Goyanka and Ms S. S. Joshi, AGPs for the Respondent –
State

....

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

DATE : 17.03.2025

PER COURT :-

The Petitioners who are similarly placed, are questioning similar communication of even date i.e. 17.02.2025, whereby the respondent Education Officer (Secondary) has refused to grant approval to their appointments as Assistant

Teachers on the ground that they were not appointed through Pavitra Portal and no other ground has been mentioned.

2. We have heard the learned advocate for the petitioners as well as the learned AGPs.

3. The Petitioners have been appointed on 26.01.2022. This court on several occasions has demonstrated as to how Pavitra Portal was not in effective operation till the year 2022 and has not been approving rejections referring to it. Some such decisions are as under:-

- (i) Writ Petition No.4344 of 2022 (Monali Vinodrao Bhuyar Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others;
- (ii) Writ Petition No.13150 of 2020 (Shaikh Jaweria Khadarsab Vs. The State of Maharashtra and others.

4. Since the Pavitra Portal was not in effective operation when the petitioners were appointed, the Education Officer could not have, by the impugned orders, refused to consider their request for grant of approval. It was imperative for him to have considered the proposals on their own merits without referring to absence of the appointment through Pavitra Portal.

5. In the light of above, we allow both these writ petitions partly, quash and set aside the impugned orders and direct the Education Officer to consider the proposals afresh on their own merits and in accordance with law, as expeditiously as possible and in any case within six weeks, but without resorting to the reasoning assigned in the impugned orders.

[Y. G. KHOBRADE, J.]

[MANGESH S. PATIL, J.]

SMS