



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

30 WRIT PETITION NO. 14237 OF 2025

Vidhya Apang Va Bal Kamgar Purnarvasaan Sanstha Through
Its Secretary

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Others

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. U.R. Awate h/f Talekar &
Associates

AGP for Respondents : Mr. S.B. Pulkundwar

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

Dated : December 15, 2025

PER COURT :-

1. Present petition has been filed to challenge the impugned communication dated 13.8.2025 to the extent of rejection of proposal of petitioner Sanstha.

2. Government of Maharashtra through its Women and Child Development Department introduced a policy by name Krantijyoti Savitribai Phule Balsangopal Scheme (hereinafter referred to as said scheme), which was for the betterment and development of the children between 0 to 18 years, who are orphaned, destitute or in need of care. Said policy further provides financial aid for the care of vulnerable children in view of Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection) Act, 2015. In

Government Resolution dated 30.5.2023 clause no.2.1 eligibility of the children or category of the children to whom the benefit to be given has been mentioned and clause no.2.2 states that such children would receive amount of Rs.2,500/- each month. The policy was to be implemented through Voluntary Organizations, who are working for development of the children and different organizations would be selected for working under the said policy will have to take responsibility of maximum 200 children. The procedure for selection of the NGO has also been mentioned in the policy. The petitioner Sanstha submitted its proposal through respondent no.4 by annexing the documents. Respondent no.4 had then forwarded it to respondent no.3 and further had reached respondent no.2. The respondent no.2, after scrutinizing documents of the petitioner found three deficiencies. By communication dated 28.10.2024 it was then informed about said deficiencies and those deficiencies were removed by the petitioner by communication dated 30.10.2024. It was again submitted to the respondent no.4. However, in the impugned order dated 13.8.2025 proposals to the extent of 395 institutions were rejected due to deficiencies. At serial no.99 name of the present petitioner appeared with the deficiencies, which were

in fact, were removed by the petitioner by communication dated 30.10.2024. Hence, the present petition.

3. Learned AGP waives notice for all respondents and seeks accommodation to take instructions.

4. In fact, when by communication dated 30.10.2024 the documents were given, which were found to be deficient in communication dated 28.10.2024, either they have not reached to respondent no.1 or respondent no.1 has not applied its mind while rejecting proposal of the petitioner. We, therefore quash and set aside the impugned communication dated 13.8.2025 issued by respondent no.1 in respect of the present petitioner and relegate the matter to respondent no.1 once again. The respondent no.1 should consider the communication by the present petitioner dated 30.10.2024 which was then submitted to the respondent no.4. If the original is not available or not traceable with the respondent no.4, then, respondent no.1 may direct the petitioner to submit copy of the said proposal directly to the respondent no.1. But rejection shall not be on the same deficiencies. Respondent no.1 should take decision within a period of (1) one month from today.

5. With these directions, writ petition stands **disposed off**.

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

...

AAA/-