



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CIVIL APPLICATION (CAW) NO. 2184 OF 2025

IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 2315 OF 2025

VIDYA VIKAS MANDAL, LAKHANDUR, DIST. BHANDARA, THR. ITS PRESIDENT, SMT.
KAVITA SADASHIV DONADKAR AND OTHERS

Vs.

STATE OF MAHARASHTRA, THR. ITS SECRETARY, MINISTRY OF EDUCATION,
MUMBAI AND OTHERS

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. R. G. Kavimandan, counsel for the petitioners
Ms. Vaishnavi Mankar h/f N. A. Waghmare, counsel for respondent nos.3 and 4.
Ms. Neha Khune, counsel for the respondent no. 3.
Ms. Kirti Satpute, counsel for the intervenor/applicant.
Mr. H. S. Dhande, AGP for the respondent / State.

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

DATED : 22.01.2026

CIVIL APPLICATION (CAW) NO. 2184 OF 2025

1. This is an application seeking permission to intervene in the petition filed by one Sadashiv Shivaji Donadkar. The applicant/intervenor seeks to intervene in the present matter as, according to her, she was a party to the original proceedings before the Education Officer, Gadchiroli. The learned counsel for the applicant/intervenor further states that the proceedings were initiated because the applicant had forwarded a proposal of one Shri Sunil Deshmukh, being the senior-most teacher, for promoting

him to the post of Head Master, which had fallen vacant. It is, therefore, in nutshell, her submission that the presence of the intervenor is necessary for proper adjudication of the matter.

2. Mr. R. G. Kavimandan, learned counsel for the original petitioners, while vehemently opposing the application, submits that during the earlier round of litigation it has been found by this Court as well as by the competent authorities that the intervenor has no locus. By pointing out the order of the Education Officer dated 08.02.2012, the learned counsel for the petitioners submits that, in Vidya Vikas Mandal, Gadchiroli, there are only three office bearers who are alive and, therefore, according to the learned counsel for the petitioners, the intervenor has no locus.

3. We have perused the record and appreciated the contentions canvassed by the learned counsel for the respective parties. As can be seen from the impugned order at page no. 138, the petitioners were party to the proceedings before the Education Officer. Therefore, to adjudicate the controversy, it would be necessary that the applicant/intervenor be present before the Court.

4. In that view of the matter, the application is allowed. The learned counsel for the petitioners are permitted to carry out the necessary amendment to add the intervenor/applicant as a party.

5. The Civil Application is disposed of.

WRIT PETITION NO. 2315 OF 2025

1. The learned counsel for the petitioners shall supply a copy of the writ petition, along with annexures, to the newly added respondent/intervenor.

2. Stand over to 06.02.2026.

(NANDESH S. DESHPANDE, J.)

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