

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.13109 OF 2025

Vinashree Vijay Maske

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra and Others

... Respondents

Mr. Avinash Fatangare a/w. Ms. Archana Shelar, Advocate for the
Petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Deolekar, AGP for the State.

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

DATE : 24th MARCH, 2026

P.C:

1. We have heard the learned Advocate for the Petitioner and the learned AGP. We have perused the judgment dated 21st June, 2024 delivered by this Court at the Aurangabad Bench in **Writ Petition No. 9163 of 2021 (Avinash Marotirao Kamble vs. State of Maharashtra and Others)**.

2. On the issue of strict compliance of the procedure prescribed for recruitment through the Pavitra Portal, this Court has delivered a judgment in **The Sudhagad Education Society and Others vs. The State of Maharashtra and Others (Writ Petition No. 10116 of 2025, Dt. 16-10-2025)**. In view of **Avinash Marotirao Kamble** (supra) in which the Court

VISHAL
SUBHASH
PAREKAR

Digitally signed by
VISHAL SUBHASH
PAREKAR
Date: 2026.03.25
10:45:10 +0530

has relied upon, **Shaikh Jaweria Khadarsab vs. The State of Maharashtra, Writ Petition No. 13150 of 2022**, the learned AGP submits that the Petitioner was not heard when the impugned order dated 13th August, 2025 was passed.

3. In **The Sudhagad Education Society** (supra) we have concluded that the Pavitra Portal has to be strictly followed in cases where the Pavitra Portal was active and the Login ID is allotted to the management, and then the recruitment has to occur only through the Pavitra Portal. But if the Pavitra Portal is inactive and there is no Login ID allotted to the management, the situation can be looked at differently.

4. In view of the above, the impugned order is set aside only to facilitate a re-hearing in the matter. The Respondent Education Society is the same 'Sudhagad Education Society'. Respondent No. 2 shall, therefore, issue notice to the management and direct the management to first file an affidavit as to whether the Pavitra Portal was active and whether the Login ID was issued to the management. Thereafter, considering the directions set out in **The Sudhagad Education Society** (supra), the Education Officer would follow the same procedure and re-consider the proposal forwarded by the management on its own merits. The Education Officer would also

consider whether Raigad Ratnagiri Times is a newspaper in which advertisement is permitted to be published before conducting the recruitment process. Respondent No. 2 would endeavour to decide the proceedings expeditiously.

5. We make it clear that we have not recorded any opinion as regards the merits of the claim either of the Petitioner or the Education Society.

6. With the above direction, **this Petition is disposed off.**

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)