

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 11768 OF 2024

Acharya Vinoba Bhave Shikshan
Prasarak Mandal & Ors.

... Petitioners

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.

... Respondents.

Mr. Prashant Bhavake, for the Petitioner.

Mr. S.B. Kalel, AGP for Respondent/State.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE AND
ASHWIN D. BHOBE, JJ.**

DATE : 3rd MARCH, 2025

P.C. :

1. Apparently, the proposal forwarded by the Management seeking approval to the appointment of the Petitioner on the aided post of Shikshan Sevak, was deficient. The Education Officer pointed out 8 deficiencies vide Communication dated 14.11.2022. However, instead of granting an opportunity to the Management to revise the proposal and submit a complete proposal in the light of the G.R. dated 10.6.2022, the proposal has been rejected.

2. In view of the above, since this is the first instance before us, when the Education Officer (Secondary), Zilla Parishad, Ratnagiri,

has passed such an order, we are not imposing costs.

3. The **Writ Petition is partly allowed and disposed off** with the following directions :

- (a) The impugned order dated 14.11.2022, stands set aside.
- (b) The contents of the impugned order would be treated as an intimation to the Management as regards the deficiencies in the proposal.
- (c) The Management shall revise the proposal and tender a proposal complete in all respects, keeping in view the check list set out in the G.R. dated 10.6.2022, within 45 days.
- (d) After the revised proposal is received, the Education Officer would deal with the said proposal on its own merits and decide the same within 45 days from the date of receipt.
- (e) If the proposal is rejected, it shall contain reasons.
- (f) If the proposal is accepted, the Management shall proceed to initiate further steps for grant of Shalarth I.D..

4. We make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion as regards the merits of the proposal.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)