

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 1455 OF 2025

Rushikesh Suresh Hiray ... Petitioner
versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ... Respondents

AND

WRIT PETITION NO. 1457 OF 2025

Nanda Ashok Arote ... Petitioner
versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ... Respondents

AND

WRIT PETITION NO. 1484 OF 2025

Mahesh Pandit Sarode ... Petitioner
versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors. ... Respondents

Mr.Sanjeev Kumar Deore for the Petitioners in all Petitions.

Mr.P.P.Kakade, Addl.GP with Ms.P.N.Diwan, AGP for the
Respondent-State in WP No. 1455 of 2025.

Mr.P.P.Kakade, Addl.GP with Ms.T.J.Kapre, AGP for the
Respondent - State in WP No. 1457 of 2025.

Mr.P.P.Kakade, Addl.GP with Mrs.P.J.Gavhane, AGP for the
Respondent- State in WP No.1484 of 2025.

Mr.Pandit Baburao Sarode, Secretary of Respondent No.4-
Management present in the Court.

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

DATE : 26th February, 2025

P.C. :-

1. In all these three matters, the learned Advocate for the Petitioners submits that he conveyed to the Petitioners to inform the Management to show the original files of selection process to the Court. However, the Secretary of Respondent No.4, Mr.Pandit Baburao Sarode, is present in the Court Hall. He has tendered three files to the Court which are the original records pertaining to the selection procedure / process followed by the Management while selecting these three Petitioners.

2. After perusing these files and considering the order that we intend to pass today, we are returning all these three original files to the learned Advocate, Mr. Deore, in the open Court.

3. Heard the learned Advocate for the Petitioners and the learned Addl.GP.

4. We have perused the impugned orders. The Education Officer (Secondary), Zilla Parishad, Nashik, Mr. Pravin Patil,

indicates a list of deficiencies pointed out to the Management. However, in the last clause of the impugned orders, it is stated that the proposals are rejected.

5. In view of the above, only to enable the Management, an opportunity to remove the deficiencies, that we are quashing the impugned orders.

6. As such, **these Writ Petitions are partly allowed.**

7. The impugned orders are quashed only to enable an opportunity to the Management to remove the deficiencies and submit a revised proposal to the Education Officer so as to be considered on its own merits.

8. The deficiencies mentioned in the impugned orders would be treated as an intimation to the Management. The Management would remove the deficiencies and submit a revised proposal, within a period of 45 days from today to the Education Officer.

9. The Secretary of the Management, who is present in the Court, submits that he would intimate the Chairman of this order.

10. Needless to state, after the revised proposal is received by the Education Officer, he would conduct a meticulous verification exercise strictly in accordance with the law and the Government Resolutions applicable. After considering the revised proposal, a reasoned order would be passed, within 30 days.

11. We make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion about the merits of the proposal and all contentions are kept open.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)