



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

927 WRIT PETITION NO. 14162 OF 2025

Ansari Zunnoorain Khaja Noorul Saqlain Ansari

VERSUS

State Of Maharashtra Through It's Secretary And Others

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Sayyed Tauseef Yaseen

Addl. GP for Respondents: Mr. S. K. Tambe

Advocate for Respondent 2 : Mr. P. D. Suryawanshi

...

AND

938 WRIT PETITION NO. 14186 OF 2025

Pathan Adnan Ahemad Anis Khan And Another

VERSUS

State Of Maharashtra Through Its Secretary And Another

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Sayyed Tauseef Yaseen

AGP for Respondents: Mr. S. B. Pulkundwar

Advocate for Respondent 2 : Mr. P. D. Suryawanshi

...

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

Dated : November 27, 2025

...

**FINAL ORDER :-** ( Per Hiten S. Venegavkar, J. )

1. Both the present petitions filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seek directions to hold and declare that the communication dated 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2025 issued by respondent no.2 is illegal, arbitrary and unreasonable and to consequently quash and set aside the same. The petitioners further pray for

grant of permanent approval to their appointments as 'Assistant Teachers' in respondent's School i.e. Miliya Primary School together with all consequential benefits.

2. The case of the petitioners is that, they are working as Teachers with the school managed by Miliya Primary School, District Beed, which is a government recognized aided school and Minority Educational Institution. Pursuant to an Advertisement dated 19<sup>th</sup> August 2019 issued for the post of 'Shikshan Sevak', the petitioners being duly qualified had applied, participated in the recruitment process and came to be selected and appointed as 'Assistant Teachers'. It is submitted that the Miliya Primary School, on several occasions had submitted proposals to the office of respondent no.2 seeking approval to the petitioners appointment, however, none of those proposals were accepted or even responded to.

3. On 24<sup>th</sup> January 2025 a fresh proposal seeking approval to the appointment of petitioner no.1 was submitted. The said proposal came to be rejected on 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2025 on the ground that name of petitioner no.1 appeared in the list of candidates allegedly involved in irregularities pertaining to the 'Teachers Eligibility Test' (in short TET) exams by disqualifying

his TET credentials. According to the petitioners, reliance is placed upon the decision of this Court in Writ Petition No.623 of 2024, wherein an almost identical facts this Court has considered the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Pramati Educational and Cultural Trust and others Vs. Union of India and others** (reported in 2014) 8 SCC 1, holding that minority institutions are exempted from enforcing 'TET' as a condition for appointment of teachers. This Court in the earlier writ petition also held that when no other reason is assigned to cancellation of appointment except non-possession of TET qualifications, the impugned decision cannot stand and the Authority must reconsider the proposal on merits without applying the TET recruitment.

4. The petitioners further place reliance on the judgment of this court in **Lahori Fouziya Noorul Hasan Vs. State of Maharashtra and others** (Writ petition no.6756 of 2024), wherein similar circumstances, the respondents were directed to grant approval and the petitioners therein were thereafter issued approval orders and their services were regularized, it is, therefore, argued that the petitioners in the present matters have a legitimate expectation that their proposals would be

considered solely on the qualifications prescribed by the Management of the Minority Institution and not on extraneous grounds such as ‘TET’ qualification.

5. Learned advocate for the petitioners submits that the right of a minority institution to select and appoint qualified teachers of its choice is an essential facet of the protection guaranteed under Article 30 of the Constitution of India, while the State may prescribe minimum qualifications to ensure educational standards once, once such qualifications are satisfied and the Minority Institutions selects a teacher, the State cannot interfere while vetoing such appointments. The impugned communication dated 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2025 is, therefore, according to the petitioners violative of Article 30, arbitrary and issued without any authority of law. It is also argued that the rejection based on the petitioners alleged inclusion in a list of candidates involved in a ‘TET’ scam is wholly irrelevant as ‘TET’ itself is inapplicable to the Minority Institutions and the petitioners have never sought any benefit arising from TET. Thus, it is contended that the impugned orders deserves to be quashed.

6. On the other hand the learned A.G.P appearing for the State supports decision of Respondent no.2 contending that the refusal to grant approval is based on cogent and valid reasons. It is argued that the petitioners have not denied alleged involvement in the TET irregularity and, therefore, their proposals do not deserve approval. It is further submitted that although the petitioners Management is a Minority Institution, the issue regarding applicability of the 'TET' to Minority Institutions is still pending before the Hon'ble supreme Court and, until such issue is conclusively settled, the action taken by respondent no.2 is legally justified. Hence dismissal of the petitions is sought.

7. We have heard the learned advocates for the parties at length and have perused the material placed on record including the judicial pronouncements relied upon by the petitioners. We find substance in the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioners. **The Hon'ble Supreme Court, in Anjuman Ishaat-E-Taleem Trust vs. State of Maharashtra and Others**, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1912, has held that TET qualification is not mandatory for teachers appointed in minority educational institutions. This issue is subjudiced

before the Hon'ble Supreme Court as the judgment in case of **Anjuman** has been referred to Larger Bench. Till the issue is not decided by the Larger Bench, approval cannot be rejected only on the said ground. The reliance placed by the petitioners on the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**Pramati Educational and Cultural Trust and others**' is well founded and this legal position has been reportedly acknowledged by this Court in subsequent decisions. We, therefore, find no reason to take a view different from the one already taken by this Court.

8. In light of this settled legal position, the rejection of the petitioners' proposal solely on the basis of alleged TET disqualification cannot be sustained. The impugned communication dated 25<sup>th</sup> July 2025 issued by respondent no.2 must therefore be quashed. However, in so far as the prayers seeking a direction to grant permanent approval to the petitioners appointments with all consequential benefits is concerned, we are not inclined to exercise our writ jurisdiction to issue such a mandamus. Approval of appointment is an administrative function that must first be considered by the competent authority in accordance with the law and applicable

judicial precedents. It would therefore be appropriate to direct reconsideration of petitioners proposal.

9. Accordingly, we **partly allow** the petitions. The impugned communications dated 25.7.2025 issued by respondent no.2 rejecting the petitioners proposals for approval of their appointments as 'Assistant Teachers' in respondent no.3 school is hereby quashed and set aside. Respondent no.3 shall re-submit afresh the proposals for approval of the petitioners appointments to the respondent no.2 within a reasonable time. Upon receipt of such proposals, respondent no.2 shall decide the same afresh, in accordance with law keeping in view the judicial pronouncements of this Court as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court referred to herein-above and shall pass a reasoned order within a period of 12 (Twelve) weeks from the date of receipt of proposals.

10. With these directions, the writ petitions stand **partly allowed and disposed of**. There shall be no order as to costs.

( HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J. )      ( SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI, J. )

...

AAA/-