



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

34 WRIT PETITION NO. 15049 OF 2025

Sunil Bibhishan Bhosale

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Others

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Ameya Sabnis h/f E.S. Murge

AGP for Respondents: Mr. S.K. Tambe

Mr. B.B. Bhise advocate for Respondent nos.2 and 3

...

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

Dated : December 15, 2025

FINAL ORDER :-

1. Present writ petition has been filed to challenge suspension order of the petitioner dated 19.11.2025 issued by respondent nos.2 and 3.

2. Heard Mr. Sabnis h/f Mr. Murge learned advocate for the petitioner, Mr. Tambe, learned AGP and Mr. Bhise, learned advocate appearing for respondent nos.2 and 3.

3. Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that, inadvertently, petitioner had given his joining date in the form for transfer and on the basis of that, upon a complaint

made by the third person, without giving any opportunity to the petitioner, he has been suspended by the impugned order.

4. We have gone through the Government Resolution dated 18.06.2024. Though it was online process which was undertaken for transfer of the teachers, in view of the Government Resolution, according to us, there was a stipulation contemplated in 5.10.4 regarding verification of the documents.

5. It is to be noted that though the petitioner might have filled the form for transfer, yet whether to transfer him or not was still in the discretion of the respondent no.2. At that time, there could have been verification of the service record. In the impugned order also, it has not been stated that because of the incorrect date, how entire process of transfer of the petitioner got affected or how he got benefit out of the same. Another important fact is no opportunity appears to have been given to the petitioner to submit his say. When all these facts were pointed out, learned advocate for the respondent nos.2 and 3, upon telephonic instructions from both of them, submits that they are ready to call back the suspension order dated 19.11.2025.

6. In view of the said statement, purpose of the petition has been served and the petitioner shall then be **reinstated** in the service. Still, we grant liberty to the respondent no.2 to make an inquiry and then come to a definite conclusion. While making inquiry, opportunity should be given to the petitioner to put forth his say. With these observations, the petition stands **disposed off** and we hope that the respondent nos.2 and 3 would act upon the statement **immediately**.

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

...

AAA