



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

BENCH AT AURANGABAD

921 WRIT PETITION NO. 13887 OF 2025

1) ANKUSH BALAJI MANE, 2) GAJENDRA RAOSAHEB DESHMUKH,
3) GAJANAN SUBHASH DEVKATE, 4) GOVIND RAMDAS ANKADE,
5) SANTOSH SAHEBRAO CHAVAN

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND
OTHERS

...

Mr. V.S. Panpatte Advocate for Petitioner.

Mr. S.B. Narwade, A.G.P. for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

...

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

DATE : 10th DECEMBER, 2025

ORDER :

1. Present Petition has been filed for directions to respondent Nos.1 and 2 to include the name of the petitioner in *Shalarth Pranali* and directions to respondent Nos. 3 and 4 to release the arrears of the salary of the petitioners.

2. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioners and learned AGP for respondent Nos.1 and 2. No necessity to issue notice to respondent Nos.3 to 5 since the matter is pending before

respondent No.2 – the Deputy Director of Education, Aurangabad Division, Aurangabad. The petitioners are the teachers working in respondent No.5 school. Their services have been approved and now as regards their salary is concerned, the proposal was submitted on 24th April 2024, separately in respect of each of them by respondent No.5 to respondent No.3. Respondent No.3 – the Education Officer (Primary), Zilla Parishad, Beed, has in fact recommended the said proposal in favour of the petitioners and forwarded the same to respondent No.2. It is pending with respondent No.2 since 24th May 2024.

3. Learned AGP places copy of letter dated 26th March 2025 issued by respondent No.2, which is taken on record by marking Exhibit "X", wherein it is stated that by communication dated 15th March 2024 it was directed that the absorption of the surplus teachers should be made and for that purpose it is necessary to get instructions, as to whether five teachers from respondent No.5 school have joined the services at the absorbed place.

4. In fact, we do not find any connection between the proposal which is pending before respondent No.2 with the process of absorption. When the services of the petitioners have

been approved by the procedure contemplated under the law then the next step for including their names in *Shalarth Pranali* has to be undertaken. It appears that the respondent officers working under the Education Department are finding new grounds each time to reject the proposals or do such acts which prompts the teachers to approach this Court, which those officers can avoid.

5. We, therefore, dispose of the Writ Petition by giving direction to respondent No.2 to decide the said proposals, which are pending with him, with recommendations, since 24th May 2024, within a period of TWO MONTHS from today. If the names of the petitioners are included in the *Shalarth Pranali*, then respondent Nos.3 and 4 to take further steps to release the arrears of salary, within a period of SIX WEEKS thereafter.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE