



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

BENCH AT AURANGABAD

912 WRIT PETITION NO. 13852 OF 2025

ANITA MURLIDHAR JAGTAP

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH ITS SECRETARY AND
OTHERS

WITH

CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 13315 OF 2025

IN WP/13852/2935025

DHONDIRAM VITTHALRAO KHANDADE

VERSUS

ANITA MURLIDHAR JAGTAP AND OTHERS

...

Mr. Irfan D. Maniyar Advocate for Petitioner.

Mr. S.B. Pulkundwar, A.G.P. for Resp. Nos. 1 and 2.

Mr. U.B. Bondar Advocate for Resp. Nos. 3 and 4.

Mr. V.D. Gunale Advocate for applicant in Civil Application
No.13315 of 2025.

...

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

DATE : 4th DECEMBER, 2025

ORDER :

1. Present petition has been filed for direction to respondent
No.3 – the Education Officer (Primary), Zilla Parishad, Latur to

decide the proposal dated 3rd September 2025 and the consequential prayers have also been asked.

2. Learned AGP waives notice for respondent Nos.1 and 2. Learned Advocate Mr. Bondar waives notice for respondent Nos. 3 and 4. No necessity to issue notice to respondent Nos. 5 and 6 at this stage taking into consideration the prayer clause which only we are considering right now.

3. Civil Application No. 13315 of 2025 has been filed. We have heard learned Advocate Mr. V.D. Gunale for the applicant. He submits that the applicant is senior to the petitioner and now the school is getting 60% grants. The applicant had approached respondent No.3, Education Officer on the point of seniority and then communication dated 2nd August 2024 has been given stating that the applicant should approach the management. He submits that if the petitioner's proposal is decided, then it would be the injustice to the applicant.

4. As regards the intervention application i.e. Civil Application is concerned, the applicant therein has no cause of action as on

today. The proposal has been submitted but it has not been decided. The remedy for the applicant is elsewhere and therefore, the Civil Application deserves to be rejected.

5. So far as the Writ Petition is concerned, upon instructions from respondent No.3, learned Advocate for respondent No.3 makes a statement that the said proposal would be decided on its own merits, within a period of four weeks.

6. We take the said statement as an undertaking and dispose of the Writ Petition by directing respondent No.3 to decide the said proposal within a period of FOUR WEEKS from today.

7. Civil Application No.13315 of 2025 stands rejected.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE