

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

WRIT PETITION NO.13669 OF 2025

Sakshi Sachin Kirve

... Petitioner

vs.

The Education Officer (Secondary),
Zilha Parishad, Pune & Ors.

... Respondents

AND

WRIT PETITION NO. 13697 OF 2025

Surekha Sahadu Arote

... Petitioner

vs.

The Education Officer (Secondary),
Zilha Parishad, Pune & Ors.

... Respondents

Mr.Rajaram Deshmukh with Mr.Aryan Deshmukh, Mr.Bhushan Deshmukh, Mr.Vikrant Desai and Ms.Ankita Salvi for the Petitioners in both the Petitions.

Ms.Priyanka Chavan, AGP for the Respondent -State.

...

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

DATE : JANUARY 16, 2026

PC:

1. In both these Petitions, the identically placed Petitioners are aggrieved that their transfers from the un-aided establishments to the 20% aided establishments, under Rule 41 of the Maharashtra

Employees of Private Schools (Conditions of Service) Rules, 1981, have not been accorded approval by the competent authority only for the reason that these Petitioners were granted individual approvals to their appointments on un-aided establishments, in the “Individual Approval Camp”. Such camps were routinely held by the Education Department.

2. While considering the proposals forwarded by the Management for approval to the transfers from un-aided establishments to the 20% aided establishments, the concerned authority has to verify as to whether the Petitioner, in the first place, has received an approval to his appointment on un-aided establishment. If the approval is not in existence, then it would tantamount to an unauthorized appointment.

3. In both these Petitions, though the photostat copies of such approvals are placed on record, the authorities who have maintained the inward and outward registers, do not find that such approval orders were released after being recorded in the outward registers. In short, the transmission of these approvals, which should find a mention in the outward registers, is not found in such

registers. The outward number on the approval order does not match with the entries made in the outward registers.

4. This is a peculiar situation. On the one hand, the Petitioners have approval orders to their appointments made on the un-aided establishments. On the other hand, the competent authority is unable to trace out the records pertaining to the issuance of such approval orders and the transmission to the Management, which has to be mentioned in the outward registers.

5. The Division Bench of this Court at the Aurangabad Bench has delivered a judgment in the case of ***Pramod Prabhakar Pokale v/s. State of Maharashtra and Others***¹ concluding that once an approval is legally granted to the appointment of an employee, while entertaining a proposal for e.g. for transfer to the aided establishment or for any other reason including the reason for grant of Shalarth ID, the approval can not be cancelled. It is only when the department notices a glaring fraud in the authenticity of such approval order, that a particular procedure can be followed to deal with the situation.

1 AIR OnLine 2019 Bom 30.

6. In view of the peculiar facts and circumstances discussed above, we find that it would be appropriate to direct the authority dealing with the proposals with regard to these Petitioners, which are forwarded by the Management, to verify the approvals granted to these Petitioners. The Education Officers, who have signed the orders issuing approvals in the Camps held by the department, shall also be called upon to make a statement as regards their signatures on the approval orders. It would be in the interest of justice that the Management as well as the concerned employees are given an opportunity of personal hearing in order to find out whether the authenticity of the approval orders could be questioned.

7. After completing such exercise, if the approvals are found to be in order, the competent authority can accord its sanction to the proposal forwarded by the management seeking transfer of these Petitioners from the un-aided establishments to the partially aided establishments. If the approval orders are found to be fictitious, a reasoned order be passed in order to enable the aggrieved party to assail the said adverse orders. Let this exercise be completed within a period of 120 days from today. Needless to state, if the Petitioners

succeed in getting the sanction to their transfers, they would be entitled for all monetary benefits from the dates of tendering of the proposals by the management.

8. With the above directions, **these Petitions are disposed off.**

(ABHAY J.MANTRI, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)