

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

(SR.NO.12) WRIT PETITION NO.1525 OF 2025

Umakant Sugriv MamilePetitioner

Vs.

Shri Siddheshwar Shikshan Prasarak

Mandal Narkhed and Ors.Respondents

WITH

(SR.NO.13) WRIT PETITION NO.1528 OF 2025

Sitaram Bhimrao KamblePetitioner

Vs.

Shri Siddheshwar Shikshan Prasarak

Mandal Narkhed and Ors.Respondents

Mr. Anant Vadgaonkar for the Petitioner.

Mr. P. P. Kakade, Addl. G. P. a/w Ms. P. B. Chavan, AGP for the State in WP/1525/ 2025.

Ms. P. M. Joshi, AGP for the State in WP/1528/2025.

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

DATE : 4th FEBRUARY, 2025

P.C. :-

1. The learned Advocate for the Petitioners has drawn our

attention to almost three rounds of litigation entered into by these Petitioners, since they had to challenge the first termination order in the first round. After succeeding in the first round of litigation, and the Management not approaching the High Court, they were reinstated and again terminated. Again they entered into a second round of litigation and again succeeded. The Management did not challenge even that order. The Petitioners were reinstated and now the Management has declared that the posts are abolished and converted into clock hour basis (CHB) and the Petitioners are directed to join on clock hour basis (CHB).

2. On each occasion, the Petitioners were granted reinstatement with backwages. The backwages were never paid. Reinstatement was made only to create a picture of compliance of the order. The Petitioners have also initiated proceedings for execution of the orders of the School Tribunal under Section 13 of the Maharashtra Employees of Private Schools (Conditions of Service) Regulation Act, 1977. They can also initiate steps under Section 3 of the Maharashtra Educational Institutions (Management) Act, 1976 by which the Director of Education can take over the management of the Institution and ensure that the Institution is

conducted in accordance with the Rules and in the interest of education and the students.

3. Considering the above, the learned Advocate for the Petitioners submits that he would approach the Director of Education Maharashtra State at Pune.

4. In view of the said statement, and that the Petitioners' grievance can be considered by the said Authority, **both these Writ Petitions are disposed off.**

5. Needless to state, the Director of Education or such Authority as may be delegated with the powers, shall consider the grievance of these Petitioners, and initiate effective steps after granting reasonable opportunity of hearing to all stakeholders and pass a reasoned order to ensure that the institution is properly conducted.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)