



{1}

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

942 WRIT PETITION NO. 2404 OF 2026

Saraswati Shaikshanik Pratishthan Va Sevabhavi Sanstha Through Its
Secretary And Another

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Others

.....

Mr. Krishna P. Rodge, Advocate for Petitioners

Mr. S.B. Narwade, AGP for Respondents No.1 to 4

Mr. S.B. Pulkundwar, Advocate for Respondents No.5 and 6

.....

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

DATE : 26 MARCH, 2026

PER COURT :-

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

“B) By issuing appropriate writ, order or direction in the like nature, the respondent No.4 may kindly be directed to decide the proposal dated 11.07.2025 (Exh. I) submitted by petitioner No.2 within a stipulated period and for that purpose, necessary orders be passed.”

2. Learned AGP waives service of notice for respondents No.1 to 4. Learned advocate Mr. S.B. Pulkundwar waives service of notice for respondents No.5 and 6.

3. The petitioners had approached this Court by filing Writ Petition No. 6315 of 2024 earlier and by order dated 27.06.2024, the petition

{2}

was dismissed on the ground that the impugned order therein is not an order which can be put to any implication, much less against the interest of the petitioners. Thereafter, respondent No. 4 has issued letter dated 03.06.2025 to petitioner No. 1 stating that in view of the Government Resolution dated 28.07.2021, fresh proposal should be submitted by considering the 28 points included in the said Government Resolution. The petitioners state that accordingly the proposal was submitted on 11.07.2025 to respondent No. 4; however, it has not yet been decided.

4. When the petitioners have come with a limited prayer to give directions to respondent No. 4 to decide the proposal dated 11.07.2025, we need not adjourn the matter for taking instructions. It is, in fact, the statutory duty of respondent No. 4 to decide such proposal, and if the role of respondent No. 4 is limited, then it should be forwarded to the appropriate authority within a reasonable period. He cannot sit over the file for months together.

5. Taking into consideration the Government Resolution dated 28.07.2021, it has been stated that the Education Officer should scrutinize such proposal and forward it to the Deputy Director of Education of the Division, and thereafter, the said authority, by giving his own remarks, should place it before the Government. Therefore, we

{3}

direct respondent No. 4 to scrutinize the proposal dated 11.07.2025 within a period of fifteen days, and forward it to respondent No. 3. We further direct respondent No. 3 to give his opinion, as contemplated under the Government Resolution dated 28.07.2021, within a period of fifteen days thereafter and forward it to the appropriate authority, i.e., either respondent No. 1 or respondent No. 2, as the case may be. Thereafter, respondents No. 1 and 2 shall take a decision on the said proposal on or before 31.05.2026.

6. With the aforesaid directions, we dispose of the writ petition.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

S P Rane