

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 2490 OF 2013

- 1) Kiran S/o Nana Sonar
Age 23 years, Occu. Labour,
R/o Kanchan Nagar, In front of Police Station,
Plot No. 45, Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.
 - 2) Sanjay S/o Rajaram Jagtap,
Age 41 Years, Occu. Labour,
R/o : Shivaji Nagar, More Mamalatdar Plot,
Jalgaon, Ta. & Dist. Jalgaon.
 - 3) Mahendra S/o Khanderao Pagare,
Age 48 Years, Occu. Labour,
R/o Shivaji Nagar, In front of Rokel Godown No. 1,
Jalgaon.
 - 4) Shamkant S/o Arun Patil,
Age 21 years, Occu. Student,
R/o : Pot Chardi, Tq. Chopda, Dist. Jalgaon.
 - 5) Raju s/o Jimram Sonone,
Age 42 Years, Occu. Labour,
R/o : Plot No. 23, Near Well, Dinkar Nagar,
Asudha Road, Jalgaon.
 - 6) Arun S/o Dagdu Patil,
Age : 49 Years, Occu. Agril. Labourer,
R/o : Post Chardi, Tq. Chopda, Dist. Jalgaon.
 - 7) Tushar S/o Dhanaji Sonawane,
Age 25 years, Occu. Service,
R/o Kanchan Nagar, Gut No. 11/2, Plot No. 40,
Near Charitable Hospital, Jalgaon.
- ..Petitioners**

Versus

- 1) The Government of India
- 2) Central Bank of India,
Regional Office, Jalgaon. Kala Bhawan,

Plot No. 8, Vidyut Colony, N. H. No. 6,
Jalgaon, Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.

- 3) Kirn Pradeep Parerao,
Age Major, Occu : Service,
Having office at : Central Bank of India,
North Maharashtra University Brnach,
At Post : Bhmburi, Tal : Dharangaon,
Dist : Jalgaon.
- 4) Deepak Subhash Kadam,
Age Major, Occu: Service,
Having office at : Central Bank of India,
At Post : Waghli, Tal: Chalisgaon, Dist. Jalgaon.
- 5) Rajendra Namdev Shandane,
Age : Major, Occu : Service,
Having office at : Central Bank of India,
At Post : Chahardi, Tal : Chopla, Dist. Jalgaon.
- 6) Yogesh Haribhau Patil,
Age : Major, Occu : Service,
R/o Gendalal Mill, Yogesh Tailor,
Shivajinagar, Jalgaon, Tal : Dist : Jalgaon. .. **Respondents**

ALONG WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 7174 OF 2013

Gokul s/o Shantaram Patil
Age : 25 years, Occu – Service,
R/o At Post Mamurabad,
Tq. & Dist. Jalgaon.

.. **Petitioners**

Versus

1. The Central Bank of India,
Corporate Office, Chander Mukhi,
Nariman Point, Mumbai 400021.
2. The Regional Manager,
The Regional Office,
the Central Bank of India, Jalgaon.
3. The Branch Manager,
Central Bank of India, Branch Mamurabad,

Taluka and Dist. Jalgaon.

4. The Zonal manager,
Central Bank of India,
Station Road, Nagpur.

.. Respondents

Mr Deshmukh, Advocate for the petitioner in WP No. 2490 of 2013
Mr P. N. Kutti, Advocate for petitioner in WP No. 7174 of 2013
Mr N. T. Tribhuvan, Advocate for respondent No. 1 in WP No. 7174 of 2013
and respondent No. 2 in WP No. 2490 of 2013
Mr Mukul Kulkarni, Advocate for respondents No. 3 to 5 in WP No. 2490 of 2013
Mr Swapnil S. Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 6 in WP No. 2490 of 2013

**CORAM : A. V. NIRGUDE &
V. K. JADHAV, JJ.**

DATE : 19TH JANUARY, 2015

ORAL JUDGMENT : [PER A. V. NIRGUDE, J.]

1. Heard learned counsel for respective parties.

2. The facts of the cases, in nutshell, are as under:-

The petitioners sought employment pursuant to the advertisement dated 17th October, 2012, issued by respondent No. 2 – Bank. Though they apparently fulfilled the eligibility criteria mentioned in the advertisement for the candidates who had already worked in any of the Branches of the Bank, they were not selected. Therefore they felt aggrieved and filed the present petitions. It is their case that persons having no experience were selected. They also alleged that the Bank did not declare result of selection process.

3. We are not impressed with these submissions advanced by petitioners and the complaints. The Bank's advertisement clearly mentioned that the vacancies would be filled up with candidates coming from out side / freshers and also from candidates who had worked for the Bank (Veteran).

4. We are told by learned Counsel appearing for respondent No. 2 that the Bank has selected candidates from both the categories.

5. We are not inclined to go into the question as to why the petitioners were not selected. This would require subjective satisfaction which we are not going to undertake for deciding these petitions. It is also impertinent.

6. These petitions do not deserve admission. Hence, the petitions stand dismissed.

(V.K.JADHAV, J.)

(A. V. NIRGUDE, J.)