

rajshree

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

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO.2143 OF 2025

Dhumal Priti Dilip ... Petitioner
vs.
Deputy Director of Education,
Pune Division & Ors. ... Respondents

WITH

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO.2145 OF 2025

Chetana Kiran Shinde ... Petitioner
vs.
Deputy Director of Education,
Pune Division & Ors. ... Respondents

WITH

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO.2149 OF 2025

Rupali Mahadev Margaje ... Petitioner
vs.
Deputy Director of Education,
Pune Division & Ors. ... Respondents

WITH

CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO.2150 OF 2025

Narayan Madhukar Kashid ... Petitioner
vs.
Deputy Director of Education,
Pune Division & Ors. ... Respondents

WITH
CIVIL WRIT PETITION NO.2151 OF 2025

Sunita Bajirao Khopade ... Petitioner

VS.

Deputy Director of Education,
Pune Division & Ors. ... Respondents

— — — —

Mr.Sugandh Deshmukh a/w Mr.Aniket Kanawade, for the Petitioners.

Mr.V.G. Badgujar, AGP for the Respondent-State in WP No.2143/2025 and WP No.2150/2025.

Mr.P.P. Kakade, Addl. GP a/w Ms.P.N. Diwan, AGP for the Respondent-
State in WP No.2145/2025 and WP No.2151/2025.

Mr.K.S. Thorat, B Panel Counsel for the Respondent-State in WP No.2149/2025.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, JJ**

DATE : 14th JULY, 2025.

P.C.

1. The learned AGP has strenuously pointed out that the impugned orders in these matters have been passed on merits.
2. These are peculiar cases wherein the Management concedes that they have committed a blunder in mentioning the dates of

appointments of the Petitioners and various other defective dates in the proposals forwarded to the Deputy Director of Education, Pune Division, Pune. As a consequence of such defective proposals, rejection of the proposals was a fait-accompli.

3. The learned Advocate for the Petitioners fairly submits that, on the one hand, the Petitioners have been affected by the defective proposals sent by the Management and on the other hand, the reasons mentioned in the impugned orders are in relation to such defects committed by the Management. The appointment of these Petitioners took place between 2012 to 2017, much prior to the ban on recruitment imposed by the State Government. Since the defective dates indicate that these Petitioners were appointed during the ban period, the proposals have been rejected.

4. The learned Advocate for the Management submits with regret and apology that it is the mistake of the Management which has led to the impugned orders and prays that the Management be granted an opportunity to correct the proposals and file revised proposals within 30 days from today.

5. In view of the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the impugned orders will be treated as having lost its efficacy, since the proposals contain several defects including defective dates of appointments.

6. We direct the Management to submit proper proposals to Respondent No.1 within 30 days from today, by ensuring that there will not be defects in the proposals. If this happens once again, and the matter is brought to this Court by any aggrieved party, we would be constrained to impose heavy costs on the Management and such amount would be donated to the State Government.

7. After the revised proposals are filed by the Management, Respondent No.1 would consider the proposals strictly in accordance with the Rules and Policies applicable and, thereafter, pass reasoned orders within 60 days of the receipt of the proposals.

8. With the above directions, these **Writ Petitions are disposed off.**

(GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, J)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)