

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
BENCH AT AURANGABAD.
APPELLATE SIDE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 7148 OF 2014

SANDIPAN PANDHARINATH PAWAR
VERSUS
THE MAHARASHTRA STATE TRANSPORT CORPORATION
(M. S. R.T. C.), MUMBAI AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Dambe Santosh S.
Advocate for Respondent No.3 : Mr. Bagul D.S.
...

CORAM : **S. V. GANGAPURWALA and
V. L. ACHLIYA, JJ.**

DATE : 24th February, 2015.

P.C.:

. Mr.Dambe, learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that the Petitioner possesses the qualification of ITI Fitter and seven years of experience. Pursuant to the advertisement issued by the Respondents, the Petitioner applied for the post of Bodyfitter. The Petitioner was, thereafter, allowed to appear for the written test and was also called for the oral interview, however, he is not considered on the ground that the Petitioner is ineligible. According to the learned counsel, there is no separate course of ITI Bodyfitter. The Petitioner is qualified for the said post. As such, his application was processed and was also called for the interview. According to the learned counsel, as there is no separate course of Bodyfitter, the Petitioner having passed the course of ITI Fitter, was eligible to be considered for the said post.

2 Mr.Bagul, learned counsel for the Respondent submits that Sathajodari / Bodyfitter / Sheet Metal, are the posts available for the persons who have passed ITI Sheet Metal course. The Petitioner is not possessing the said qualification. The post of ITI Sheet Metal is

available. The Respondents have not considered any candidate for the post of Sathajodari / Bodyfitter / Sheet Metal, possessing ITI Fitter qualification.

3 In view of the statement made by the Respondent that for the post of Sathajodari / Bodyfitter / Sheet Metal, only the persons possessing ITI Sheet Metal qualification are considered and the Petitioner, admittedly, does not possess the said qualification and only possess the qualification of ITI Fitter. The Petitioner has applied for the post of Bodyfitter. As such, the application of the Petitioner is not considered by the Respondents.

4 In light of the above, no case for interference is made out. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

[V. L. ACHLIYA, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

ndm