



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

919 WRIT PETITION NO.13957 OF 2025

Lahu Trimbak Shelke

.. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Maharashtra
Through Its Secretary,
School Education and Sports Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
2. Deputy Director of Education,
Divisional Deputy Director Office,
Aurangabad.
3. Navgan Shikshan Sanstha Rajuri (Navgan),
Taluka and District Beed.
4. The Principal,
Arts and Commerce College,
Chausala, Taluka and District Beed.

.. Respondents

...

Mr. C. V. Thombre, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Mr. V. M. Kagne, AGP for Respondents/State.

...

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

DATE : 29 JANUARY 2026

ORDER :

. Present petition has been filed for following reliefs :-

“A) By issuing appropriate writ or order the respondent No.2 may kindly be directed to grant approval as per proposal dated 31.03.2015 and earlier proposal

submitted in camp held at Chh. Sambhajnagar dated 09.09.2004, 17.08.2005, 02.08.2006 and 13.08.2007 from academic year 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07 and 2007-08 for granting staff approval and individual approval for his appointment and also grant other benefits for which petitioner is entitled as per rule.”

2. Heard learned Advocate Mr. C. V. Thombre for the petitioner and learned AGP Mr. V. M. Kagne for respondent Nos.1 and 2/State.

3. Perusal of the documents would show that on 31.03.2015 a proposal has been submitted for approval of the sanctioning of the staff and for appointment of the staff for standard 11th and 12th of Arts and Science Junior College, Chousala, Taluka and District Beed. Those proposals are stated to be given at the camp for the year 2004-05, 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08. In fact, we wonder as to how the concerned college/institution could have kept quiet for so many years if the proposals were pending. Learned Advocate for the petitioner submits that for the subsequent period, then approval has been granted. He also submits that as per the oral instructions, those proposals are not traceable with respondent No.2 and, therefore, the decision has not been taken.

4. Learned AGP, upon instructions from respondent No.2, submits that if the proposals are submitted afresh within a period of four weeks, then they would decide the same on their own merits within a period of eight

weeks.

5. We do not want to go much into those details, however, if the proposals are forwarded by respondent Nos.3 and 4 within a period of four weeks, for which the petitioner has to make a request to respondent Nos.3 and 4, then on the submission of those proposals, respondent No.2 to take decision on the same on its own merits within eight weeks from today.

6. With these directions, the writ petition stands disposed of.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm