



{1}

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

**924 WRIT PETITION NO. 105 OF 2026**

Bharati Shreepat Desale And Another

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra

Through Its School Education And Sport Department And Others

**AND**

**926 WRIT PETITION NO. 113 OF 2026**

Rohini Babulal Masule And Another

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through Its School Education And Sports  
Department And Others

.....

Mr. A.S. Gadekar, Advocate a/w Mr. S.R. Sapkal, Advocate for  
Petitioners in both WPs

Mr. S.B. Pulkundwar, AGP for Respondents No.1 to 4 in WP/105/2026

Ms. Neha B. Kamble, AGP for Respondents No.1 to 4 in WP/113/2026

.....

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND  
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

**DATE : 13 FEBRUARY, 2026**

**PER COURT :-**

1. The present petition has been filed for following reliefs:

*“B. By issuing writ of mandamus or any other writ, or order in the like nature, this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to direct the respondent No. 03 to Add the name of the petitioner no.01 in the 'shalarth system'.*

*C. By issuing writ of mandamus or any other writ, or order in the like nature, this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to direct respondent No. 03. to consider the proposal forwarded by the Respondent no.04 at the earliest in time bound manner, and for that purpose issue necessary order.”*

{2}

2. Learned AGP waives service of notice for all the respondents and submits that he could not get instructions from respondent No. 3, as respondent No. 3 has gone to the Principal Seat in connection with some other matters

3. It is to be noted from the documents that the proposal to include the name of the petitioner in the Shalarth ID System was submitted on 03.05.2019, and it is further submitted that respondent No. 4 had forwarded the same to respondent No. 3 on 16.05.2019. Now, learned AGP makes a statement that during 2019 many bogus letters were issued and that there are also doubts in respect of approvals.

4. Here it is to be noted that we are going into the facts; as the documents are produced, it appears that such a proposal was given and it was forwarded to respondent No.3. If that proposal has been received by respondent No. 3, then he ought to have decided it. He cannot sit over the file for years together. On the said forwarding letter, there is an acknowledgment of the office of respondent No. 3 dated 20.05.2019. Under such circumstances, we dispose of the writ petitions by directing respondent No. 3 to take a decision on the proposals in respect of inclusion of the petitioners' name in the *Shalarth* ID System within a period of eight (8) weeks from today.

[ HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR ]  
JUDGE

[ SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI ]  
JUDGE