

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

APPELLATE SIDE, BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.3994 OF 2003

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders.	Court's or Judge's orders
--	---------------------------

Mr.S.D.Hiwrekar, advocate for the Petitioners.
Mr.S.N.Pagare, advocate for Respondent No.2.
Mr.Yeshwant More, advocate for Respondent No.4.
Mr.S.M.Vibhute, advocate for Respondent No.7.

**CORAM : S.V.GANGAPURWALA &
A.I.S.CHEEMA, JJ.**

Date : 18.04.2015.

PER COURT :

1. Heard.

2. Mr.Hiwrekar, learned counsel for the petitioner strenuously contends that pursuant to the advertisement issued by the Respondent No.2 for filling in the posts of class III and class IV category employees from reserved category by way of a special drive. The petitioners had applied for the post of Duyyam Aveshak and Mishrak respectively. The persons were called for interview by issuing call letters, however, the petitioners were never issued call letters. The petitioners are discriminated. There was no reason for not issuing call letters to the petitioners. The petitioners complied all the terms and conditions laid down in the

advertisement.

3. Mr.Pagare, learned counsel for the Respondent Municipal Corporation submits that the call letters were issued in the proportion of 1:15 for one post. For shortlisting the candidates, marks obtained in the course of examination were also considered and call letters were issued to only those shortlisted candidates. The Recruitment Rules are strictly followed.

4. We have considered the submissions canvassed by learned counsel for respective parties, so also have considered the averments made in the Writ Petition and the affidavit-in-reply.

5. This Court while admitting the petition has not granted any interim relief. Initially this Court has granted interim relief but subsequently on 10.8.2004, the interim order was vacated.

6. Today all the petitioners would have become age barred. No purpose would be served by considering the petition on merits. The appointments have been effectuated long back.

7. In light of that, the Writ Petition is disposed of. Rule discharged. No costs.

(A . I . S . CHEEMA, J .)

(S . V . GANGAPURWALA, J .)

Dt..18.04.2015.
asp/office/wp3994.03

