

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

WRIT PETITION NO.13347 OF 2025

Swapnil Vinayak Patil

....Petitioner

Versus

The Education Officer (Secondary) and Ors.

....Respondents

Mr. Rameshwar N. Gite for the Petitioner.

Mr. P.P. Kakade, Addl. GP a/w. Ms. P.N. Diwan, AGP for the
Respondent, the State.

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE

&

HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.

DATE : 4th MAY, 2026

P.C. :-

1. The advertisement is published in a practically unknown newspaper, 'Dainik Balekilla', and the appointment of the Petitioner is said to have been made on 16th June, 2016. The proposal was tendered for approval on 2nd July, 2019, and the same is said to be pending with Respondent No.1.

2. The learned Addl. GP submits that a detailed verification/scrutiny, including whether the advertisement was

published in a widely circulated newspaper and whether the selection process was strictly in accordance with the applicable procedure, would be conducted. An opportunity of hearing would be granted to the Management if any deficiency is found, and after a revised proposal, upon removal of all deficiencies, is tendered, a reasoned order would be passed.

3. In view of the above, **this Petition is disposed off** with the following directions :

- a) Respondent No.1 would make a preliminary scrutiny of the said proposal within 15 days from today.
- b) After scrutiny, if he notices any deficiencies, he would issue a notice to the Management on their email address and communicate the deficiencies within 7 days.
- c) Thereafter, the Management would be at liberty to tender a revised proposal, after removal of all deficiencies, within a period of 21 days.
- d) After Respondent No.1 receives the revised proposal, a proper scrutiny and verification in accordance with the Rules, Policies and the Government Resolutions as may be applicable, shall be carried out and a reasoned order on the proposal would be passed within a period of 30 days.

4. We make it clear that we have not expressed any opinion upon the pending proposal and the concerned authority would be at liberty to deal with the proposal on its merits.

(HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, J.) (RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)