

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 856 OF 2026

UDAY
SHIVAJI
JAGTAP
Digitally
signed by
UDAY
SHIVAJI
JAGTAP
Date:
2026.04.09
20:45:22
+0530

Sachin Raghunath Chavare

... Petitioner

Versus

The State Of Maharashtra and Ors.

... Respondents

.....
Mr. Satish Raut for the Petitioner.

Mr. V.M. Mali, AGP for the Respondent - State.
.....

**CORAM : MADHAV J. JAMDAR &
PRAVIN S. PATIL, JJ.**

DATE : 6th APRIL, 2026.

P C. :

1. The Petitioner, by way of present petition, challenges the order dated 22nd April 2022 passed by Respondent No.2 – Deputy Director of Education of rejecting the proposal of the Petitioner to include his name in the Shalarth I.D.

2. The Petitioner has pointed out that after his appointment on 31st May 2003, his services were duly approved by the Education Officer, vide his orders dated 20th October 2003 and 23rd October 2004.

3. It is further pointed out by the Petitioner that during his service

tenure, he was declared surplus against the post of Junior Clerk and Respondent No.3 directed his absorption as per the Government Policy. Accordingly, the services of the Petitioner were absorbed in Respondent No.5 – School.

4. After the absorption of Petitioner, a fresh proposal was submitted to the Respondent No.3 on 18th October 2021 for inclusion of Petitioner's name in Shalarth Pranali for the purpose of releasing his regular salary.

5. The Respondent No.3 forwarded the proposal to the Respondent No.2 – Deputy Director of Education, Pune for inclusion of Petitioner's name in the Shalarth Pranali. It is also pointed out that the Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad, Solapur has also recommended to the Respondent No.2 for inclusion the name of the Petitioner along with other surplus persons who have been absorbed in the school.

6. In this background, the Respondent No.2 by the impugned order dated 22nd April 2022 rejected the proposal on the ground that as his name was not included in the Shalarth Pranali before 2017 and there is a delay in forwarding the proposal at the instance of the Respondent – authorities.

7. In our considered opinion, as per the law laid down by this Court in Writ Petition No. 8966 of 2021 (**Amol Baban Sangar vs. State of Maharashtra & Ors.**), it is clarified by this Court that while considering the proposal of Shalarth Pranali, the Deputy Director of Education has no powers under the scheme to review the order for the purpose to include his name in Shalarth Pranali. Under the Policy of the State Government of Shaparth Pranali, the Deputy Director of Education cannot examine the legality and validity of the approval granted to the appointment of the employee by the Education Officer.

8. In view of this settled position of law, the impugned order passed by the Respondent No.2 by disclosing the reason as aforesaid, does not survive and same is liable to be quashed and set aside in view of Policy framed by the State Government as well as law laid down by co-ordinate Bench of this Court in Amol Sangar (supra).

9. In the circumstances, the Writ Petition is allowed.

10. The Respondent No.2 – Deputy Director of Education is directed to include the Petitioner's name in the Shalarth Pranali and provide Shalarth

I.D. to the Petitioner immediately. So also, release the consequential benefits in favour of the Petitioner within a period of one month from the date of production of this order before the Respondent No.2.

11. The Writ Petition stands disposed of in the above terms. In view of disposal of the Petition, pending Applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

[PRAVIN S. PATIL, J.]

[MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.]