



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 13891 OF 2025**

Sachin Pitambar Pawara And Another

**VERSUS**

The State Of Maharashtra Through Its School Education And Sports  
Department And Others

**WRIT PETITION NO. 13892 OF 2025**

Chetana Babulal Masule And Another

**VERSUS**

The State Of Maharashtra Through Its School Education And Sport  
Department And Others

Mr. A. S. Gadekar and Mr. S. R. Sapkal, Advocate for petitioners  
Mr. S. B. Narwade, AGP for respondent-State

**CORAM : Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi &  
Hiten S. Venegavkar, JJ.**

**DATE : 11<sup>th</sup> December, 2025**

**PER COURT :-**

1. In both the matters the petitioners are contending that the proposal to include their names in Shalarth system is yet pending before respondent No. 3.

2. In the morning session, we had asked learned AGP to take instructions thereupon, he is producing communication Exhibit 'X'. It is stated that taking into consideration the date of proposal, the Inward Register has been checked but according to him, the office is not sure as to whether the respondent No. 4 has forwarded the said proposal to his

office or not. He states that he is making inquiry which will be completed within a period of two weeks and thereafter, the affidavit will be filed.

3. We take letter Exhibit 'X' as totally insensitive. Respondent No. 3 is a Officer and is not expected to indulge in such activity as to whether a communication has been made inward or not and whether it is received or not. In such situations, he can use his powers and if such proposal has not yet reach to him and when inquiry is made from the High Court, he can say that he will call the papers from his subordinate and would deal with the matter. When the instructions were asked as to how much time he will take to decide the proposal that letter sounds arrogant, we deprecate such practice. The petitioner has produced the photocopy of proposal dated 16.05.2019. It appears that the Educational Institution through his Headmaster forwarded the proposal dated 03.05.2019 to the respondent No. 4 which was duly received by the officer of respondent No. 4 thereafter, it appears from the documents those have been filed that by communication dated 16.05.2019 respondent No. 4 forwarded the proposal to the office of respondent No. 3. It appears the acknowledgment of the office of respondent No. 3 dated 20.05.2019. When such proposal is pending since 2019, we were not expecting the respondent No. 3 to act in such a way.

4. In such scenario, we dispose of the writ petitions by directing the respondent No. 3 to call the papers from respondent No. 4 if they have not yet reached his office within a period of two weeks and decide the said proposal within a period of two months from today.

**(Hiten S. Venegavkar, J.)**

**(Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi, J.)**

B. S. Joshi