

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

(920) WRIT PETITION NO. 1235 OF 2025

Savita Amit Gujar ...Petitioner

Versus

Deputy Director of Education Pune Division
And Ors. ...Respondents

AND

(92) WRIT PETITION NO. 19152 OF 2024

Reshma Tulshiram Dhadve ...Petitioner

Versus

Deputy Director of Education Pune Division
And Ors. ...Respondents

Mr. Sugandh Deshmukh, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Ms. Priyanka Chavan, AGP for the Respondent/State in
WP/1235/2025.

Mr. S.P. Kamble, AGP for the Respondent/State in WP/19152/2024.

Mr. Sachin Hande a/w Ms. Poonam Pal, Advocate for Respondent
No.3 & 4.

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE

&

GAUTAM A. ANKHAD, JJ.

DATE : 16th JULY, 2025

P.C. :-

1. The learned AGPs have 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 appointment 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 appointments 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 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 facts and circumstances of the case, the impugned orders will be treated as having lost their efficacy, since the proposals contain several defects including defective dates of appointment.

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.)