

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 6839 OF 2015

Nanda Sahebrao Shete

.. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

.. Respondents

Shri R. S. Shinde, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Shri V. H. Dighe, A.G.P. for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

Shri P. D. Suryawanshi, Advocate for the Respondent Nos. 3 and 4.

CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA

N. W. SAMBRE, JJ.

DATE : 16TH SEPTEMBER, 2016.

PER COURT :

. Mr. Shinde, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, there were large scale irregularities in the written examination conducted for the post of Anganwadi Supervisor. In the examination hall the answers were provided to some of the candidates. The mobiles were used. The petitioner was given less marks. The examination was held on 17.05.2015 and the result was also declared on the same day. The learned counsel submits that, on the next day interviews were conducted and the appointment orders were also issued. According to the learned counsel the selection process itself was carried with irregularities and illegalities. The respondents be directed to make enquiry

upon the same. The selection process be quashed and set aside.

2. Mr. Suryawanshi, the learned counsel for respondent Nos. 3 and 4 submits that, no illegality has been committed. Everything has been recorded. On the same day assessment of the written examination was made by machine and on the very same day the list was published on the website. On the next day interviews were conducted. No illegality has been committed by respondents.

3. We have considered the submissions canvassed by learned counsel for respective parties.

4. The examinations were conducted under the supervision of the Collector. Except bald statement made, there is nothing on record to suggest the acts of giving answers in the examination hall. The said fact is denied by respondents in their affidavit in reply. The petitioner has secured less marks, as such is not selected. After the petitioner has failed in the selection process, said allegations seems to have been made.

5. Considering the above, no interference is called for. The writ petition is dismissed. No costs.

[N. W. SAMBRE, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]