



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

29 WRIT PETITION NO. 4563 OF 2026

Samata Sanjivani Bahuuddeshiy Shikshan Prasarak Mandal
Through Its President Chhayatai Vithhalrao Nutte

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Others

Mr.N.N.Bhagwat, Advocate for petitioners
Mr.R.S.Wani, AGP for respondents

**CORAM : SMT.VIBHA KANKANWADI &
AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, JJ.
DATE : APRIL 27, 2026**

ORDER :-

Present petition has been filed for the following main
reliefs:-

B) By issue of writ of madamus or any other appropriate writ, the respondents be directed to process and take final decision on the proposal dated 30/08/2018 submitted by the petitioner for the renewal of the Registration Certificate of Samata Sanjivani Bahuuddeshiya Shikshan Prasarak Mandal Tiruka Dwara Sanchlit Shri Vyanktesh Balgruh, Tel. gangakhed, Dist. Parbhani.

C) By issue of writ of madamus or any other appropriate writ, the respondents be directed to sanction the proposal dated 30/08/2018 submitted by the petitioner seeking permission for the renewal of the Registration Certificate of Samata Sanjivani Bahuuddeshiya Shikshan Prasarak Mandal Tiruka Dwara Sanchlit Shri Vyanktesh Balgruh, Tel. gangakhed, Dist. Parbhani.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner. Issue notice to the respondents. Learned AGP waives notice for all the respondents.

3. The petitioner has come with a case that respondent no.2 had issued the registration certificate to the petitioner on 04.01.2010 for running a Children Home namely, Vyankatesh Balgruha, Tq. Gangakhed, Dist. Parbhani. It had intake capacity of 100 children. According to learned counsel for the petitioner, after coming into force the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, the petitioner had submitted an application/proposal on 30.08.2018. When the registration certificate was given, there was no stipulation of period for which it was given, yet when the new enactment came, the application was given, however, the said application/proposal has not yet been decided. Hence, for a limited prayer, the petitioner before this court.

4. Before we could pass an order or take cognizance of the petition, we had directed the learned AGP to take oral instructions from the respondent no.4 as to whether the activities at the petitioner's Observation Home are going on. Upon instructions, learned AGP makes a statement that the said Observation Home is closed.

5. In the entire petition, the petitioner has not stated as to why he had not approached this court within a reasonable period from the date of the proposal. It would, therefore, be not proper for this court to ask the respondents to decide the said proposal which was then submitted on 30.08.2018.

6. We **dispose of** the Writ Petition by directing the petitioner to file a fresh proposal with all the recent requisites and by giving the present factual situation in respect of its building, staff, etc., within a period of two weeks from today. Thereafter, the respondents to take the appropriate decision by following the due procedure within a period of three months.

[AJIT B. KADETHANKAR, J.]

[SMT.VIBHA KANKANWADI, J.]

KBP

.....