



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

**951 WRIT PETITION NO. 5097 OF 2023**

**RUPALI BALASAHEB KATHLE  
VERSUS  
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND OTHERS**

.....  
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Taur Mahesh S.  
AGP for Respondents/State : Ms. Neha Kamble  
.....

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE &  
Y.G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.  
DATE : 13<sup>th</sup> August, 2025**

**PC. :-**

1. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioners and the learned AGP for the Respondent Nos.1 & 2.
2. On 30.07.2025, we had simply adjourned the petition for the learned AGP to take instructions in the matter as the documents filed along with the petition and the manner in which the petition has been prepared and filed, appear to be placing confusing material before this Court.
3. With the assistance of the learned AGP, we have found that the impugned order was passed more than three years ago on 31.01.2022, which is a detailed order issued by the Respondent No.2/Education Officer giving reasons as to why the proposal submitted for granting approval to

the appointment of the Petitioner as Shikshan Sevak was rejected. The said impugned communication / order records as many as ten reasons for rejection of proposal for approval. These include, amongst other things, absence of crucial documents to show that the post on which the Petitioner was appointed was advertised in the first place and that all necessary steps were taken by the Management before appointing the Petitioner.

4. It is also relevant to note that as far back as on 01.12.2020, the Respondent No.2/Education Officer had communicated to the Management about number of deficiencies and it was clearly stated that responsibility was on the Management to make good such deficiencies, further indicating that the proposal for approval was being rejected. In other words, the proposal was rejected twice over on 01.12.2020 and 31.01.2022.

5. Considering the documents on record, we find no fault with the Respondent No.2/Education Officer who has passed the impugned order.

6. In such a situation no relief can be granted to the Petitioner in the present petition. Hence, the Writ Petition is dismissed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

7. Needless to say, the Petitioner is at liberty to approach the Management for seeking appropriate relief.

[Y.G. KHOBRADE, J.]

[MANISH PITALE, J.]