



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

912 WRIT PETITION NO.13399 OF 2025

Qureshi Abdul Rashid Shaikh Chand

..Petitioner

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra
Through Deputy Director Of
Education And Others

..Respondents

.....
Mr. Zaidi Ali Zeeshan M., Advocate for the Petitioner.
Mr. S. B. Pulkundwar, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 and 2/State.
.....

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 02 DECEMBER 2025

ORDER :

1. Present petition has been filed for directions to respondent Nos.1 to 3 to decide the representations of the petitioner dated 07.07.2005 and earlier representation by giving opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and the respondent/trust within a stipulated period.

2. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner and learned AGP for the respondents/State.

3. The petitioner contends that he is life and executive member of respondent/Trust. Respondent Nos.4 and 6 are stated to be the trustees

and respondent No.5 is the former headmaster. According to the petitioner, there are irregularities committed and there is illegal transfer of respondent Nos.7 to 12 from D.Ed. college to aided secondary and higher secondary school run by the Trust. According to the petitioner, the provisions of Maharashtra Employees of Private Schools Act, 1977 has not been complied with by the Education Department, yet in view of the illegal transfers the employees are getting the salary from the Government, thereby the petitioner intends to say that the Government is also being cheated.

4. The first and the foremost fact that is required to be considered is that as per the representation that is alleged to have been made by the petitioner, the appointments were made between 2012 to 2018 and in the meantime even in 2015-2016, there were illegal transfers. The petitioner might not be in the direct management, but he states that he is the life and executive member. So he should be aware about the activities those were going on in the employment or the schools or colleges run by the Trust. It appears that he started collecting the documents in 2016 and not prior to that and it appears that in spite of collecting the documents, the representation that has been made appears to be for the first time on 01.07.2025 and secondly on 07.07.2025, which is belated. There is no

such document that has been produced by him that immediately after the appointment, he had taken any objection. Further, no such application or complaint appears to have been made by him before the Education Officer. The representations appear to be belated and, therefore, there is no necessity to direct respondent Nos.1 to 3 to decide those representations by invoking the constitutional powers of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

5. The writ petition stands dismissed.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm