



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

WRIT PETITION NO.55 OF 2025

Nizamiya Bahu Uddeshiya Sanstha, thr. its President
.Vs.
State of Maharashtra and ors.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions Court's or Judge's orders.
and Registrar's Orders.

Mr. P.P. Thakre, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. J.Y. Ghurde, AGP for respondent Nos. 1 to 3/State.

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE AND
SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, JJ.
DATE : 23.06.2025

1. The record depicts that respondent Nos.7 and 8 were appointed way back in the year 2020-21 onwards and accordingly, approval was granted to their appointments vide orders dated 19.03.2018 and 05.10.2019.

2. The cancellation of approval was sought by the petitioner before the authorities and there is a recommendation to cancel the approval. It is the case of the petitioner that the recommendation to the extent of cancellation of approval made by the Grievance Committee and also that of by the Deputy Director of Education is not acted upon by the authorities till this date. As such this petition.

3. The fact remains that said respondents are shown to be in service, as could be inferred from the appointment orders from the year 2011.

4. If the appointment was illegal, it was open for the petitioner to undertake appropriate steps in absence of there being any statutory embargo.

5. The petitioner has prayed this Court to issue order in that regard to initiate steps in relation to services of respondent Nos.7 and 8 who were, according to the petitioner, appointed illegally.

6. Rather the petitioner is trying to place the cart before the horse by contending that the approval needs to be cancelled by directing the competent authorities i.e. Education Officer and the Deputy Director of Education.

7. Once, according to the petitioner, respondent Nos.7 and 8 are not qualified and their appointments were way back backdoor entries, it was always open for the petitioner to initiate appropriate steps as available in law.

8. In such an eventuality, the principle of equity cannot be exercised in favour of the petitioner as petitioner himself has failed to demonstrate that its conduct is in accordance with the principles of equity.

9. That being so, no case for causing interference in extraordinary jurisdiction is made out. Writ petition accordingly fails and is dismissed. Pending applications if any stand disposed of.

(SACHIN S. DESHMUKH, J) (NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)