



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 6508 OF 2025

Ravi Ranganath Sonwane

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through Its Secretary And Others

...

Mr. S. M. Kulkarni, Advocate for the Petitioner

Mr. S. D. Ghayal, AGP for Respondent/State

Mr. N. S. Kadam, Advocate for Respondent no.2

Mr. V. G. Salgare, Advocate for Respondent no.3(i)

Mr. P. S. Paranjape, Advocate for Respondent No.3(ii)

...

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 8678 OF 2025

IN WP/6508/2025

.....

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

DATED : 03RD SEPTEMBER, 2025

ORDER :-

. Heard learned Counsels for the parties. We find that respondent nos.1 and 2 are represented by the learned AGP, respondent no.3(i) is represented by learned Advocate Mr. V. G. Salgare, who has already filed vakalatnama. As regards respondent no.3(ii), learned Advocate Mr P. S. Paranjape has instructions and he states that vakalatnama shall be placed on record within one week. Respondent no.4 is served, but she has chosen not to appear

before this Court.

2. By this petition, the petitioner has prayed for the following reliefs:

A] By issuing a writ of *certiorari* or any appropriate writ, order, or direction in the like nature the order dated 08.05.2025 putting Petitioner under suspension passed by Temporary Trustees may kindly be quashed and set aside.

B] By issuing a writ of *mandamus* or any appropriate writ, order, or direction in the like nature the action of temporary trustees initiating a departmental enquiry against the Petitioner is bad in law and contrary to the provisions of MEPS Act.

3. During the course of arguments a specific statement was made on behalf of respondent no.3(i) that although suspension order dated 08.05.2025 was issued against the petitioner, it was never implemented and that there is no intention to implement the same as the petitioner is now admittedly working in the approved post of Head Master. In the light of the said statement recorded before this Court, prayer clause 'A' does not survive.

4. As regards prayer clause 'B', which pertains to the action of departmental inquiry being instituted against the petitioner

and the same being contrary to the provisions of the Maharashtra Employees of Private Schools (Conditions of Service) Regulation Act, 1977 and the rules framed thereunder, a further statement is made on behalf of the said respondent that as on today, there is, in fact, no departmental inquiry pending against the petitioner. Therefore, even the said prayer clause 'B' is not pressed on behalf of the petitioner.

5. It is brought to our notice that respondent nos.3(i) and 3(ii) are working as 'temporary trustees' as per the order dated 01.07.2019, passed by the Charity Commissioner, Aurangabad with a specific stipulation that they are to look after only day to day affairs of the trust till new managing committee comes into existence after disposal of scheme proceedings and that they are not to take any policy decision without seeking directions from the concerned authority under Section 41(A) of the Maharashtra Public Trusts Act, 1950.

6. Considering the aforesaid statements recorded in this order, we are satisfied that this Writ Petition need not remain pending before this Court any longer.

7. In view of the above, it is disposed of as such.

8. Pending Civil Application stands disposed of.

[Y.G. KHOBRADE, J.]

[MANISH PITALE, J.]

Rushikesh/2025