

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

WRIT PETITION NO.6671 OF 2025

Prakash Ramrao Mane and Ors. .. Petitioners
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra,
Through Ministry of Education and Sports and Ors. .. Respondents

Mr. Shubham Vasekar, Advocate for the Petitioners.
Mr. Satyajeet A. Rajeshirke, Advocate for the Respondents.

**CORAM : SHREE CHANDRASHEKHAR &
MANJUSHA DESHPANDE, JJ**

DATE : 31ST JULY 2025.

PC. :

The petitioners have made a prayer seeking direction to the respondents to consider them for appointment as “Shikshan Sevak” for Class VI to Class VIII. They claim that they possess requisite qualification for appointment to the post of “Shikshan Sevak”.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners has referred to a decision of this Court in Writ Petition No.256 of 2025 (*Vinanti Vijay Nivalkar & Ors. Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors.*) which was disposed of by an order dated 5th February 2025 with the following directions to the respondents :-

“6. In view of the above, this writ petition is disposed of with the following observations :-

- (a) Respondent no.1 shall consider the above stated prayer clause (a) of the petitioners in the light of the contentions that these petitioners have already passed TAIT in 2017.
- (b) Respondent no.1 would consider all the relevant Government Resolutions that are applicable and especially the Circular dated 13th October 2016, the Government Resolution dated 23rd June 2017, the Government Resolution dated 7th February 2019 and the Government Circular dated 25th February 2019 and the two Judgments of this Court dated 28th July 2021 in Writ Petition

No.2920 of 2020 (*Dipak S/o. Macchindra Sonawane Vs. The State of Maharashtra and Anr.*) and 7th October 2022 in Writ Petition No.7790 of 2019 (*Abhijit Madhavrao Patil and Ors. Vs. The State of Maharashtra and Ors.*).

- (c) Needless to state, we have not expressed any view or opinion as regards the claim of the petitioners, that as they have passed the TAIT in 2017, they are not required to appear for the said exam again in order to be appointed as trained graduate teachers.
- (d) Let a reasoned order be passed within 60 days from today.”

3. The petitioners’ grievance is that they were not considered for the appointment, notwithstanding the fact that they possess the requisite qualification and fulfill the conditions in the Government Resolutions. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners’ grievance is confined to and are seeking a direction for the consideration of their claim for appointment to the post of “Shikshan Sevak”. In view of the limited prayer for a direction for consideration of the claim for appointment as “Shikshan Sevak”, this writ petition stands disposed of with a direction to the respondent no.1 to consider the claim of the petitioners in the light of the applicable Government Resolutions and keeping in mind the fact that they have qualified TAIT in 2017. However, we would also indicate that this Court has not expressed any opinion whether the petitioners after passing TAIT in 2017 are qualified or are to appear in the said examination again for seeking appointment.

4. Writ Petition No.6671 of 2025 is disposed of.

[MANJUSHA DESHPANDE, J.]

[SHREE CHANDRASHEKHAR, J.]