



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

906 WRIT PETITION NO.13722 OF 2025

Nitesh Vilas Patil

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through Its Secretary And Others

...

Mr. V. S. Panpatte, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. A. M. Phule, AGP for Respondent Nos.1 to 4/State.

...

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

DATE : 24 DECEMBER 2025

ORDER :

. Present petition has been filed for directions to respondent No.2 to include the name of the petitioner in Shalarth Pranali and to release the salary after salary bill is forwarded by respondent No.6 as per the 20% grants available to the post held by the petitioner in view of Government Resolution dated 06.02.2023.

2. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a qualified teacher, who came to be appointed on 09.01.2014. Approval was granted by the Education Officer (Secondary) on 07.02.2014 from 09.01.2014 as Assistant teacher. Thereafter, as per the Government Resolution dated 06.02.2023 and Departmental Communication dated

25.03.2023 issued by respondent No.3, the post held by the petitioner was held to be eligible for getting 20% grants from 01.01.2023. Accordingly, the proposal was submitted to the Education Officer. Education Officer had forwarded the said proposal for including the name of the petitioner in Shalarth Pranali, however, the said proposal dated 13.12.2023 is still pending with respondent No.2.

3. The learned Advocate for the petitioner relies on various decisions of this Court wherein directions were given to the Education Officers and the Deputy Director of Education to take appropriate steps.

4. Learned AGP waives notice for respondent Nos.1 to 4/State. There is no necessity to issue notice to respondent Nos.5 and 6. Upon instructions from respondent No.2, the learned AGP submits that they are verifying the approval order and if that approval order is given, then the proposal would be decided within a period of eight weeks from today.

5. The important point to be noted here is that the proposal was submitted to the Education Officer by respondent Nos.5 and 6 and, thereafter, it has been then forwarded by the Education Officer (Secondary) i.e. respondent No.3 to respondent No.2. We presume that respondent No.3 would have verified the documents before forwarding it to respondent No.2. It appears that in all 52 documents have been

annexed to the proposal. There was absolutely no such situation for respondent No.2 to sit over the file since 13.12.2023 and, therefore, even if respondent No.2 wants to verify the documents, he can verify the same, but we dispose of the writ petition by directing respondent No.2 to decide the proposal within a period of four weeks from today.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm