

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 7628 OF 2025

Neeta Chandansingh Thakur

...Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

...Respondents

- Mr. Anandsingh Sangramsingh Bayas, for Petitioner.
- Mr. M. M. Nerlikar, Addl. GP for Respondent Nos.1 to 4.

**CORAM : MANISH PITALE AND
Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.**

DATE : 01st JULY 2025.

P. C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.
2. By this petition, the petitioner has challenged order of suspension dated 24th March 2025, issued by the management. It is settled law that the scope to interfere with an order of suspension is limited and it is only when such a suspension order is found to be issued without jurisdiction or it is found to be wholly malicious and vexatious that the Court would be inclined to interfere with such an order of suspension.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present case fits into the narrow scope available for interference with the order of suspension. In support thereof, he relied on an order

dated 25th April 2023, passed in Writ Petition No.4642 of 2023 (Balbhim Shekba Garad Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors.), wherein notice was issued in a matter where an order of suspension was apparently challenged.

4. We find that the said order can be of no assistance to the petitioner, because while issuing notice, this Court recorded that the charge-sheet therein consisted only of stale charges, which were about 32 years old.

4. As opposed to said factual position, a perusal of the letter allegations dated 21st March 2025, issued in the present case to the petitioner, would show that there are number of serious allegations made against the petitioner, including reference to written complaints given by girl students, who live in a hostel of which the petitioner is the Superintendent. Details have been recorded in the list of allegations to show that the petitioner was not performing duties upto the mark and therefore, the management was constrained to issue the list of allegations. It is in this backdrop of such allegations pertaining to incidents as recent as March 2025, that the management has issued the impugned suspension order dated 24th March 2025. It is not even alleged that the said order is issued without jurisdiction and the only

allegation appears to be that the management has proceeded in a most malicious and vexatious manner.

5. The ground raised on behalf of the petitioner is not made out by the documents and material on record. Hence, no case is made out for interference with the impugned order.

6. The writ petition is dismissed.

7. Needless to say, the observations made in this order will not prejudice the petitioner on the merits of her defence in the proposed enquiry.

(Y. G. KHOBRAGADE, J.)

(MANISH PITALE, J.)