



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CONT. PETITION NO. 1020 OF 2024
IN WP/7561/2024

Marathwada Navnirman Lokyat Manavlok
Through Its Secretary
Aniket Dwarkadas Lohiya

....Petitioner

VERSUS

Vijay Waghmare & Others

.....Respondents

.....
Ms. Vaishali Kalyankar h/f Mr. Prashant Dama, Advocate for the
Petitioner
Mr. A.S. Shinde, AGP for State
Mr. S.S. Tope, Advocate for respondent No. 4
Ms. Pooja Apache, Advocate for respondents No. 6 to 8
.....

**CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI AND
SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, JJ.**

DATE : 13th AUGUST, 2025

ORDER :

1. The petitioner has claimed disobedience of order passed by this Court on 29.07.2024 in Writ Petition No. 7561 of 2024.

2. By the said order, this Court directed as follows:

“2. The learned Advocate for the University submits that as on date, the perspective plan does not include the Petitioner's location for the unaided B.S.W. course. A competent committee has been constituted and which is

making a survey of various areas. The Petitioner's representation dated 15.11.2019, pending with Respondent No.5, can be considered. The Petitioner would be given an audience and after considering the representation of the Petitioner, competent committee would take a decision. Such decision would be communicated to the Petitioner.

3. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits on instructions that the Petitioner is agreeable.

4. In view of the above, this Writ Petition is disposed off."

3. Respondents contend that the decision is taken on the representation of the petitioner dated 15.11.2019, which is rejected on the ground that the place where petitioner intends to run the said course is not in the perspective plan of the university. Thereafter again by order dated 17.07.2025 proposal of the petitioner to run B.S.W. course is rejected by Higher and Technical Education Department. In this view of the matter the order is complied with.

4. Learned advocate for the petitioner raises a grievance that this Court by order passed in Writ Petition No. 1251 of 2023 has directed the respondents to consider the case of the petitioner afresh on its own merits observing that, petitioner's claim shall not be rejected on the ground of ban

since this ground is not available to the authorities for rejecting the proposal. Therefore, authorities should not have rejected the proposal of the petitioner.

5. That is not the subject matter of the present contempt petition. In view of compliance of the order, contempt petition is disposed of.

(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.)

(NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI, J.)