



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

927 WRIT PETITION NO. 7491 OF 2025

Ajay Rajendra Pete

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through Its Secretary And Others

...

Mr. Nagargoje Ankush Nivrutti, Advocate for the Petitioner

Mr. S. B Pulkundwar, AGP for Respondents State

Ms. Yogita Thorat, Advocate for Respondent No.3

Mr. A. S. Jagtap, Advocate for Respondents 4 and 5

.....

CORAM : **MANISH PITALE &**
Y. G. KHOBRADE, JJ.

DATE : **22nd August, 2025**

P. C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2, Mrs. Thorat, learned counsel for Respondent No.3 and Mr. Jagtap, learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 4 and 5.

2. The petitioner has assailed rejection of his proposal for transfer from unaided to aided division on the basis of certain deficiencies pointed out by Respondent No.3-Education Officer (Primary) in communication dated 09.03.2021, addressed to Respondent No.5-Headmaster of the School.

3. Upon issuance of notice, Respondent Nos. 4 and 5 are now represented by the aforesaid counsel. Upon instructions, he makes a statement that since number of deficiencies are pointed out in the proposal, the respondent Management shall submit a fresh proposal before Respondent No.3 Education Officer demonstrating that the deficiencies have been removed and this court may consider issuing a

direction to Respondent No.3- Education Officer to decide the proposal in a time bound manner.

4. We are of the opinion that a number of deficiencies have been indicated in communication dated 09.03.2021 and since the respondent Management is ready to make good the deficiencies, appropriate directions can be issued for carrying out the necessary exercise in a time bound manner.

5. In view of above, Respondent No.4 Management is directed to submit fresh proposal within four weeks from today.

6. The Education Officer (Primary), Zilla Parishad, Nanded shall pass appropriate order on such fresh proposal within three weeks of having received the same.

7. The petition is disposed of in the above terms.

8. It is made clear that this court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the matter.

9. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)

JPChavan