



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 4153 OF 2025

1. Nitin s/o Keshavrao Chaukhande
Age: 55 years, Occu: Service as a
Jr. College Teacher presently working
with J. D. Patil Sangludkar
College Daryapur, Tq. Daryapur,
Dist. Amravati.

... **PETITIONER**

...VERSUS...

1. The State of Maharashtra
through its Secretary,
School Education and Sports Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.
2. The Deputy Director of Education,
Amravati Region, Amravati.
3. Shri Shivaji Shikshan Sanstha,
Amravati, Shivaji Nagar, Amravati- 444603
through its President/ Secretary.
4. Janta Vidyalaya and Jr. College,
Nerpimpalgaon, Tq. Morshi,
Dist. Amravati
Through its Headmaster

...**RESPONDENTS**

Mr. K. D. Pote, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. H. N. Jaipurkar, AGP for the respondent(s)/State.

Shubham

**CORAM : SMT. M.S. JAWALKAR AND
NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, JJ.**

DATED : 02nd APRIL, 2026.

ORAL JUDGMENT (NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, J.)

1. Notice to the respondents.
2. Learned AGP waives notice for respondent nos. 1 and 2.
3. In view of the limited prayer being sought in the petition notice to the respondent nos. 3 and 4 is dispensed with.
4. **Rule.** Rule is made returnable forthwith.
5. The facts which are emerging from the petition are as under:-
 - a) The petitioner herein was appointed with the respondent no.3 on the post of Shikshan Sevak on Non-Grant-in-aid Division for the academic year 2001-02, 2002-03, and 2003-04 on various dates.
 - b) On 07.09.2003, the respondent no. 3 issued a circular whereby the directions were given to the Headmasters to submit the proposals of the teachers who were appointed in the said academic years.

Shubham

c) On 15.09.2003 the respondent no. 4 forwarded the proposal of the petitioner, as well as of similarly placed employees. On 06.12.2006, since there was no decision on the said proposal, a fresh proposal was submitted.

d) In the meanwhile, appointment orders were issued from time to time by the management pertaining to each academic year. Thereafter, on 02.02.2010, the petitioner was appointed with the respondent no. 3 as a permanent teacher, and on 17.10.2010, approval was granted by the respondent no. 2 to the said appointment.

e) On 22.12.2022, in spite of several visits, the proposal for granting approval to the petitioner was not decided, despite the persistent requests made by the petitioner in that regard.

f) On 09.01.2023, the respondent no. 2 issued a communication to the respondent no. 4, i.e., the employer of the petitioner, stating that certain deficiencies are being made in the proposal and therefore the said deficiency is required to be cured so that the proposal for approval be proceeded further.

g) On 28.03.2023, the respondent no. 4 prepared a fresh

Shubham

proposal and forwarded to the respondent no. 2 for approval.

6. It is the case of the petitioner that, in spite of these facts, the proposal has not been decided, and therefore, the present petition is filed seeking a direction to the respondent no. 2 to decide the said proposal dated 28.03.2023.

7. With the assistance of the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned AGP, we have gone through the record. The facts as stated supra are, more or less, not disputed. It is also a matter of record that, on 28.03.2023, the employer of the petitioner sent a reminder, therein curing the deficiencies as pointed by the respondent no. 2 vide letter dated 09.01.2023.

8. As on date, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the proposal curing the deficiencies, sent on 28.03.2023, still pending and is not decided as yet.

9. In that view of the matter, we dispose of the petition with a direction to the respondent no. 2 to decide the said proposal sent by the respondent no. 4 for approval to the appointment of the petitioner, as expeditiously as possible, and in any case, till 31.05.2026.

Shubham

10. Needless to mention that the respondent no. 2 would decide the proposal in accordance with law, having regard to all the Government Resolutions in that context to be taken into consideration.

11. With these directions, the Writ Petition is disposed of with no order as to costs.

(NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, J.)

(SMT. M.S. JAWALKAR, J.)