

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

932 WRIT PETITION NO. 7961 OF 2024

Nilima Nitinkumar Mali Alias Nilima Vikram Mahajan
VERSUS
The State Of Maharashtra Through Its Secretary And Others

...

Shri. A. S. Mali - Advocate for the Petitioner
Shri. P. S. Patil - AGP for State
Shri. P. V. Barde - Advocate for Respondent No. 4 & 5

...

CORAM : S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR
AND
NEERAJ P. DHOTE, JJ.

DATED : 25TH JUNE, 2025

PER COURT : -

1. Heard Shri. A. S. Mali, learned Advocate for the Petitioner, Shri. P. S. Patil, learned Additional Government Pleader for the State, and Shri. P. V. Barde, learned Advocate for Respondent Nos. 4 and 5.

2. Shri. A. S. Mali, learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits that, the Petitioner was appointed on the establishment of Respondent Nos. 4 and 5 pursuant to the advertisement dated 29.01.2020, against a vacant sanctioned post. The proposal for approval to her appointment as 'Librarian' was submitted to Respondent No. 3 on 21.06.2023, and same was received by Respondent No. 3 on 26.06.2023. Meanwhile, the Petitioner has been appointed as an Assistant Teacher through the *Pavitra Portal*. However, she has not received the benefit of salary for

the service rendered as a Librarian, since the proposal for her appointment is yet to be decided by the Education Officer.

3. Mr. P. V. Barde, learned Advocate appearing for the Respondent/Management submits that, since the Proposal for approval has not been decided, the School could not release the benefit of the salary in favour of the Petitioner.

4. In this backdrop, we deem it proper to dispose off the present petition by directing the Respondent No. 3 – Education Officer (Secondary), Zilla Parishad, Nandurbar, to decide the Proposal dated 21.06.2023 forwarded by Respondent No. 5 – Headmaster of Smt. P.A. Sodha Sarvajanik Marathi High School, within a period of three (3) months from today, on its own merits. In case the proposal is decided in favour of the Petitioner, the concerned Respondent shall release all the consequential benefits. In case the Proposal is rejected, the Petitioner shall be at liberty to raise the claim for unpaid salary with the Management.

5. Writ Petition is, accordingly, disposed off.

[NEERAJ P DHOTE]
JUDGE

[S. G. CHAPALGAONKAR]
JUDGE