



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

939 WRIT PETITION NO. 8179 OF 2025

KUNAL RAJESH PATIL
VERSUS
STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

.....
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Arvind Gopalrao Ambetkar
AGP for Respondents/State : Ms. P.V. Diggikar
Advocate for Resp. Nos.5 & 6 : Mr. Abhijit Avhad
.....

CORAM : MANISH PITALE &
Y.G. KHOBRAGADE, JJ.
DATE : 16th September, 2025

PC. :-

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties. The grievance of the Petitioner in the present case is that the proposal for granting approval to the appointment of the Petitioner to the post of Shikshan Sevak Instructor has not been decided till date by Respondent No.4 i.e. the District Vocational Educational and Training Officer, Jalgaon.

2. On notice being issued, the Respondents have appeared through counsel. Respondent Nos.1 to 4 are the State Authorities and Respondent No.5 is the Management while the Respondent No.6 is the School where the Petitioner claims to be working.

3. In the reply affidavit, the Respondent Nos.2 to 4 have taken a categorical stand that the applications / proposals for granting approval to the appointment of the Petitioner on compassionate grounds were never received in the office of Respondent No.4. Such statements are made in paragraph nos.5 and 6. In fact, the copies of the inward register of Respondent No.4 for the relevant dates have been annexed to assert that no such proposals were received. It is also alleged that the signature and stamp shown on the document at Exhibit-C with the petition are not genuine.

4. When we put specific queries to the learned counsel appearing for Respondent Nos.5 and 6, it was claimed that the proposals were indeed submitted to the office of Respondent No.4.

5. We do not intend to go into such disputed questions of facts. Instead, it would be appropriate that Respondent Nos.5 and 6 submit a fresh proposal before Respondent No.4, which can be decided on its own merits.

6. In view of the above, the Writ Petition is disposed of by directing Respondent Nos.5 and 6 to submit a fresh proposal concerning the question of approval of the appointment of the Petitioner within two

weeks from today. If such a proposal is filed within two weeks from today before the Respondent No.4, the said Respondent shall take a decision on the same on its own merits within a period of four weeks of receiving the said proposal. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

7. This Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the matter.

[Y.G. KHOBRAGADE, J.]

[MANISH PITALE, J.]