

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**  
**ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**  
**WRIT PETITION (L) NO. 25046 OF 2025**

Harmeet Kaur Paramjeet Singh Godi.

Age : 33 years, Occ. Teacher,

Address : Punjabi Colony G.T.B. Nagar,

Mumbai 400037.

... Petitioner.

V/s.

1. The State of Maharashtra  
School Education and Sports Department  
Mantralaya, Mumbai 400032  
through Government Pleader  
High Court (OS), Mumbai.
2. The Dy. Municipal Commissioner Education  
Private Aided Primary School  
Triveni Sangam,  
Municipal Corporation School Building,  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Mahadev Palav Marg,  
Currey Road (E), Mumbai 400012.
3. The Deputy Education Officer  
of Private Primary School of  
Greater Mumbai Region,  
Triveni Sangam,  
Municipal Corporation School Building,  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Mahadev Palav Marg,  
Currey Road (E), Mumbai 400012.
4. Divisional Educational Inspector  
of School, Triveni Sangam,  
Municipal Corporation School Building,  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Mahadev Palav Marg,  
Currey Road (E), Mumbai 400012. ... Respondents.

---

Mr. Rahul Kadam a/w. Mr. Vedant Babar, Advocate for Petitioner.

Talwalkar

Ms. Gaurangi Patil, AGP for Respondent/State.

Mr. Shivprasad D. Borade, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 2, 3 and 4-BMC.

---

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

**DATE : 15<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER, 2025.**

**JUDGMENT (Per Ravindra V. Ghuge, J) :**

1. Leave to delete Respondent Nos. 5 and 6. Deletion be carried out forthwith.

2. Leave to correct the description of Respondent Nos. 2 and 4. Correction to be carried out forthwith.

3. Heard Mr. Rahul Kadam, the learned Advocate for the Petitioner, Ms. Gaurangi Patil, the learned AGP for the Respondent State and Mr. Shivprasad Borade, the learned Advocate for Respondent Nos. 2, 3 and 4.

3. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith and heard the Petition finally with the consent of the parties.

4. Case of the present Petitioner is squarely covered by the Judgment delivered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2025 in *Anjuman Ishaat-E-Taleem Trust v/s. State of Maharashtra and Others (Civil Appeal No. 1385 of 2025 and connected Appeals)* and the recent view taken by this Court in *Sagar Dattatray Chorghe and Others v/s. State of Maharashtra and others (Writ Petition No. 7943 of 2024 and Writ Petition No. 861 of 2025)*, on 11<sup>th</sup> September, 2025.

5. The Petitioner was appointed as a Shikshan Sevak on 14.2.2014, which is one day after TET qualification was made compulsory for the Shikshan Sevak, Assistant Teacher and Teachers. The cut off date until which the teachers were expected to acquire TET qualification, was 31.3.2019. The Petitioner acquired the C-TET qualification on 27.12.2019. By the impugned order dated 17.7.2025, the Petitioner has been issued with an order of reappointment as a Shikshan Sevak from 27.12.2019 and as an Assistant Teacher from 27.12.2022, by Respondent No.4.

6. This issue is no longer res integra. The view taken by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the Judgment delivered on 1<sup>st</sup> September,

2025 in *Anjuman Ishaat-E-Taleem Trust (supra)*, clearly mandates that teachers who are appointed without the TET qualification, are expected to acquire the qualification within two years, if they have more than five years of service available and they desire promotion. If any teacher has less than 5 years for superannuation and does not pray for promotion, he need not pass the TET.

7. In view of the above, the impugned orders are unsustainable. The Petitioner will have to be granted the approval in view of having acquired the TET qualification even prior to the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 1<sup>st</sup> September, 2025 in *Anjuman Ishaat-E-Taleem Trust(supra)*.

8. As such, this Petition is partly allowed as under :-

(A) Since the Petitioner has acquired CTET qualification on 27<sup>th</sup> December, 2019, she would be entitled for all arrears of monetary benefits as may be available to her prior thereto, from the management. She would be entitled for salary from the State Government through the salary grants to the extent they are admissible, with effect from 27<sup>th</sup> December 2019, when she acquired the CTET qualification.

(B) In the event the Hon'ble Supreme Court's Larger Bench concludes that the TET, meaning the STET or CTET, is not mandatory for the teachers working in the minority institutions, the Petitioner would be entitled to claim all monetary benefits from the date the institution has received salary grants or from the date on which the Petitioner was appointed as an Assistant Teacher, whichever is later.

9. **Rule is made partly absolute** in the above terms.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)