

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

WP No. 3995 of 2014
Jitendra v. The State of maharashtra and ors

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
 appearances, Court's orders of directions
 and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr Vivek Borkar, Adv for petitioner
 Mr C. N. Adgokar, AGP for respondents
 no. 1 to 4 and 6

CORAM : B. P. DHARMADHIKARI AND
 A. P. BHANGALE , JJ

DATED : 6th January 2015

1. Heard learned counsel for petitioner. Learned counsel submits that respondent no. 5 was not eligible and still he has been appointed and as such, the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal could not have refused to condone delay. He also points out that respondent no. 5 is continuing in employment even today. According to him, candidate at sr. no. 1 in wait list is already accommodated in other category.

2. However, petitioner is not in a position to submit that if respondent no. 5 is displaced, entitlement of the petitioner will be considered. Petitioner is also not in a position to point out the serial number at which he was placed in the Select List.

3. In this situation, we do not find anything wrong with the order of the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal refusing to condone the delay.

4. No case is made out warranting interference in writ jurisdiction. Petition is dismissed. No costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

joshi