

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 2783 OF 2026

Vaishali Sampat Kakad

....Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra & Anr.

....Respondents

Mr. Sujay Karlekar i/b. Mr. Akshay Karlekar, for the Petitioner.
Ms. Neha Bhide, GP a/w Mr. O. A. Chandurkar, Addl. GP a/w Ms.
G. R. Raghuwanshi, AGP for the State.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.
DATE : 07th MAY, 2026**

P.C. :-

1. It is an admitted position that the Petitioner, who was a permanent employee, has been terminated from service on serious allegations without even issuing a charge-sheet-cum-show-cause notice, much less holding a departmental enquiry.

2. Upon two pointed queries put by the Court as to whether a charge-sheet was issued to the Petitioner, the learned Addl. GP submits that he has no instructions, despite the fact that

the State had appeared before the Court on 06.03.2026 and 07.03.2026, when orders were passed. Yet, Mr. Chandurkar submits that he does not have instructions. We further asked him whether a Departmental Enquiry was conducted, as permissible under the Service Rules. He submits that he has no instructions.

3. We are disappointed. In this matter, the learned Government Pleader along with the present learned Additional Government Pleader had appeared on 07.03.2026. The Chief Secretary of the State of Maharashtra had participated in the hearing through the VC mode, along with Mr. Ranjeet Singh Deol, Principal Secretary, while the Deputy Secretary of Education, the Joint Director of Higher and Secondary Education, and the Joint Secretary, were present in the Court Hall. Yet, the learned Additional Government Pleader now submits that he has no instructions.

4. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits, on instructions, that even the impugned order of termination makes no reference to any charge-sheet-cum-show-cause notice or the Inquiry Officer's report or the second show-cause notice, or any such material. It is further submitted that a bystander complainant was

present during an informal hearing conducted in the office of the Joint Director of Higher and Secondary Education, and that the said complainant was prompting questions to posed by the said authority.

5. Let the above contentions and allegations be responded to, by the State through an Affidavit-in-Reply.

6. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits that the amended memo shall be supplied to the office of the learned Government Pleader. Within three weeks of the receipt of the amended Petition, an Affidavit-in-Reply shall be filed on behalf of the State. The Registry shall receive the Affidavit-in-Reply even during vacation.

7. List this Petition on **17th June, 2026**, in the ‘Urgent Supplementary Board’.

8. The ad-interim order dated 07.03.2026 would continue until further orders.

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