

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**REVIEW APPLICATION STAMP NO. 10860 OF 2015
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 4297 OF 2013**

Ramesh Pundlik Kamble

.. Applicant

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and Others .. Respondents

Shri Umakant P. Giri, Advocate for the Applicant.

Smt. S. A. Dhumal, A. G. P. for the Respondent Nos.1 and 2.

Shri V. S. Panpatte, Advocate for the Respondent No. 3.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
V. K. JADHAV, JJ.**

DATE : 29TH JULY, 2015.

PER COURT :

1. Mr. Giri, the learned counsel for the applicant submits that, in the selection process of the year, 2010 the M. K. C. L. had committed a mistake. The applicant should not be made to suffer because of the mistake committed by other party. The learned counsel submits that, even representation was given to the respondents pursuant to the orders passed by this Court in earlier writ petition bearing Writ Petition No. 580 of 2009. No

decision has been taken on the said representation. However, fresh advertisement was issued in the year, 2013. The applicant is entitled for appointment. The applicant is eligible to be appointed on the said post. The learned counsel submits that, the applicant is entitled for appointment in service as Extension Officer, Agriculture from the reserved category. The learned counsel submits that, this aspect has not been considered by the Court while dismissing the writ petition. The petitioner had secured highest marks than the other candidates, who have been appointed.

2. We have gone through the order dated 03rd December, 2014 sought to be reviewed. The jurisdiction of this Court in review is in narrow compass. The same cannot be treated as an appeal in disguise.

3. The petitioner had challenged the appointment of one Mr. Jondhale in Writ Petition No. 4297 of 2013 . The Court while deciding the said writ petition did not set aside the appointment of Mr. Jondhale. The petitioner had given representation. The Zilla Parishad thereafter had moved the State Government for converting the post which had gone to other category. The said proposal is rejected by the State. The petitioner is seeking relief

pursuant to the selection process conducted in the year, 2010. Thereafter fresh selection process, in the year 2013 was conducted and it was also observed that, the selection process pursuant to the advertisement of the year 2013 is complete and the said post has gone to other category. Considering the aforesaid aspect of the matter, we had disposed of the writ petition.

4. In light of that, no case for review is made out. The Review Application is disposed of. No costs.

[V. K. JADHAV, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

sam/July. 15