IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

995 CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 910 OF 2025
IN WP/10798/2024

SAYYAD JAUAN ASIF U G OF SAYYED MUSTAFA SAYYED MOINUDDIN
VERSUS
UNION OF INDIA MINISTRY OF SCHOOL EDUCATION AND LITERACY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Mr. S.B. Ghatol Patil, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Rajendra Sanap, Advocate holding for Mr. Uttam Bondar, Advocate for respondent No.1.
Mrs. Uma Bhosale, A.G.P. for State.
Mr. S.B. Pulkundwar, Advocate for respondent Nos.8 to 10.

CORAM : SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE AND
VAISHALI PATIL-JADHAV, JJ.

DATED : 27 October, 2026

Per Court :

1. Heard.

2. Learned counsel for respondent Nos. 8 to 10 placed on record communication dated 16.12.2025 alongwith the communication dated 15.12.2025 issued by Education Extension Officer, mentioning that as per the order under contempt hearing was given to the petitioner and his proposal/grievance has been decided. The said communication is taken on record and marked ‘X’ for identification.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner strongly opposed the submissions made by learned counsel for respondent Nos.8 to 10 by pointing out the order under contempt, especially para-15, wherein it is held that the petition only stood partly allowed to the extent of prayer clause 'D', which reads thus.

> *"D By issuing writ of mandamus, or any other writ, order or directions in the like nature, the respondent No. 2 to 4 may kindly be directed to appoint an independent enquiry officer/committee into online RTE reservation 2024-2025 conducted by Respondent No. l0 and upon conducting the detailed enquiry and cdncel the selection and waiting list of the students under 25% reserved RTE quota issued by the respondent No.10 and for that purpose necessary orders be issued".*

Learned counsel for the petitioner, therefore, submits that the B.D.O. was to conduct the inquiry and not the Education Extension Officer, Panchayat Samity, Nanded.

4. However, though it is mentioned by this Court by granting prayer clause 'D' in part, but it is not specified as to which part is allowed. On the contrary, it seems that after allowing prayer clause 'D' in part, further direction is given to Education Extension Officer, Mukhed to consider the grievance of the petitioner by extending him opportunity of hearing.

5. Therefore, we are of the opinion that the communication dated 15.12.2025 issued by Education Extension Officer, Panchayat Samity, Nanded has definitely fulfilled the order under contempt Thus, we are of the opinion that nothing survives in the petition and it stands disposed of.

(VAISHALI PATIL-JADHAV)
JUDGE

(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE)
JUDGE