

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

27 WRIT PETITION NO. 9961 OF 2012

THE MPSC, THR. ITS SEC  
VERSUS  
ASHA BALAJI GARUD AND ANR

...

Advocate for Petitioner : Mr. Kulkarni Mukul S.  
Mr. Kiran M.Nagarkar, Adv. For Resp. No.1;  
Mr. MM Neralikar, AGP for Respondent No. R/2.

...

CORAM : S.S. SHINDE & P.R. BORA, JJ.  
Dated: April 20, 2015

...

PER COURT :-

1) Heard. The petitioner - MPSC is mainly aggrieved by the observations/directions contained in paragraph 8 and 10 of the order passed by Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal (for short MAT) in Original Application No.268/2011 dated 7.10.2011.

2) Learned Counsel appearing for Respondent No.1 submits that Respondent No.1 has joined some other establishment by some other selection process, which is not the subject matter of this petition.

3) In our opinion, further adjudication of this petition would be only for academic purpose inasmuch as Respondent No.1 is already serving in some other institution, selected by separate selection committee and which is not the subject matter of this petition.

4) So far as the observations/directions contained in paragraphs 8 and 10 of the impugned order passed by MAT are concerned, we clarify that those observations/directions relate only in respect of the claim of Respondent No.1 and the cases of other candidates, who were selected by same selection process, would be governed by the letter dated 12.3.2010, written by Dy. Registrar, Ex-III, Indira Gandhi National Open University, New Delhi, (Exhibit-D, page 23 of

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

the compilation) and other candidates would not be entitled to derive any benefits consequent upon the directions/observations made by MAT in paras 8 and 10 of its order. With this clarification, the writ petition stands disposed of.

( P.R. BORA, J. )

( S.S. SHINDE, J. )

...