

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

(941) WRIT PETITION NO.3505 OF 2024

Eknath Suryabhan DukrePetitioner

Versus

Regional Deputy Director & Ors.Respondents

WITH

(504) WRIT PETITION NO.15987 OF 2023

Eknath Suryabhan DukrePetitioner

Versus

Regional Deputy Director & Ors.Respondents

WITH

(506) WRIT PETITION NO.12036 OF 2024

Ranjana Ramkrishna Bharambe alias

Ranjana Chudaman MahajanPetitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Ors.Respondents

Mr. Sugandh Deshmukh a/w. Mr. Aryan M. Deshmukh, Mr. Aniket H. Kanawade, Mr. Vaibhav Thorave, Mr. Bhushan G. Deshmukh, Mr. Irvin D'souza and Ms. Karishma Shinde for the Petitioner in WP/3505/2024 and WP/15987/2023.

Mr. Vinod Sangvikar for the Petitioner in WP/12036/2024.

Mr. P.P. Kakade, Addl. GP a/w. Ms. P.N. Diwan, AGP for the Respondent – State in WP/3505/2024 and WP/15987/2023.

Mr. P.P. Kakade, Addl. GP a/w. Ms. N.M. Mehra, AGP for the Respondent – State in WP/12036/2024.

Mr. Chintan Shah for Respondent No.2 in WP/3505/2024 and for Respondent No.5 in WP/12036/2024.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
&
ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.**

DATE : 17th FEBRUARY, 2026

P.C. :-

1. Writ Petition No.12036 of 2024 was not on board. By consent, taken on the production board.

2. Peculiar facts are before us in the light of a mess created by the Management.

3. When Writ Petition No.12036 of 2024 filed by Ranjana Ramkrishna Bharambe alias Ranjana Chudaman Mahajan v/s. The State of Maharashtra and Ors., was heard on 9th February, 2026, the learned Advocate for the Petitioner was unaware as to whether the proposal seeking approval for Ranjana was decided or otherwise. Since the Petitioner Ranjana was under the belief that her proposal was pending, we delivered an order on 9th February, 2026 and directed the Education Officer to decide the proposal within 45 days.

4. Today, while hearing Writ Petition No.3505 of 2024 filed by Eknath Suryabhan Dukre v/s. Regional Deputy Director and Ors., it is revealed that the proposal of Ranjana was already rejected

by the Divisional Deputy Director of Education on 24th July, 2025 on the ground that Ranjana and Eknath seem to have been appointed on the same post. Even the Management did not inform us on 9th February, 2026, when Ranjana's Petition was disposed off, that her proposal had already been rejected. Eknath's proposal was rejected on 2nd January, 2024 on account of certain deficiencies. A statement is made, on instructions, by the learned Advocate representing Eknath, that all deficiencies had been pointed out by Eknath and because of the deficiencies, the Authority should not have rejected the proposal, but rather should have called upon the Management to remove the deficiencies and submit a revised proposal.

5. While hearing the Petition of Eknath, we kept the Petition of Ranjana available for reference purposes. In view of lack of information on the part of the Management or the conduct of the Management in not conveying the facts to us, we disposed off the Petition of Ranjana directing the Authority to decide her pending proposal, which was already rejected on 24th July, 2025.

6. In the light of the above, what *prima facie* appears to us, as well as to the learned Addl. GP, is that the Education Authority will have consider whether Eknath or Ranjana have been appointed on the same post or whether there are two posts available which could accommodate both of them.

7. The learned Advocate representing Ranjana, who is present in the Court, submits, on instructions, that Ranjana gives her consent for recall of the order of this Court dated 9th February, 2026. We accede to his request.

8. In view of the above, the order dated 9th February, 2026, passed in Writ Petition No.12036 of 2024 filed by Ranjana, is recalled by consent. **The Writ Petition No.12036 of 2024 is restored by consent** and the order of rejection of her proposal dated 24th July, 2025 is set aside. The order dated 2nd January, 2024 in Writ Petition No.3505 of 2024 filed by Eknath is quashed and set aside only to enable the Deputy Director of Education to deal with the situation on its own merits.

9. In this backdrop, we find it appropriate to direct that the Management be given an opportunity to remove the deficiencies in the proposal of Eknath and re-submit the proposal to be considered along with the proposal of Ranjana, which also will have to be restored. If there are two posts available, the Deputy Director of Education will have to deal with the two proposals, since it is a Junior College in which Ranjana and Eknath are working and the matter would not lie before the Education Officer.

10. If there is only one post available, the said Authority will have to decide as to who amongst the two can be granted approval and in that situation, we grant liberty to the said Authority to deal firmly with the Management and even impose costs, if felt appropriate, for having forwarded two proposals of two teachers, if there was only one post available.

11. Hence, **both these Petitions are partly allowed in above terms**, with the following directions :

(a) The Management will now prepare updated proposals of both these Petitioners, complete in all respects, specifically identifying the posts on which they have been selected and appointed,

within a period of 30 days from today and re-tender both the proposals in the office of the Deputy Director of Education, Mumbai Region, Mumbai.

(b) The said Authority will issue notice to the Management as well as to Ranjana and Eknath after receiving the two proposals from the Management and commence a hearing on both the proposals.

(c) All the stakeholders would be granted adequate opportunity of being heard. Written submissions are also permitted.

(d) The hearing would be completed within 60 days from the date of filing of the two proposals by the Management and a reasoned order shall be passed, which would be communicated to the Management as well as to Ranjana and Eknath, on their respective email addresses, as follows :

eknath.dukre55@gmail.com

ranjanam733@gmail.com

(e) If any of the parties are aggrieved by the order, they would be at liberty to avail of a remedy as is permissible in law.

WRIT PETITION NO.15987 OF 2023

12. This Petition has been filed by Eknath and is not on board today. On request, taken on the production board.

13. The learned Advocate appearing for Eknath submits, on instructions, that in the light of the above order, this Petition would not survive and may be disposed off.

14. As such, **this Writ Petition No.15987 of 2023 stands disposed off**, on instructions.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)