

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

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

Court's or Judge's orders

914 **WRIT PETITION NO.8655 OF 2016**

BALU SARJERAO BHOSALE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for Petitioners : Mr.S.D. Karkare.
AGP for Respondents/State: Mr.A.G. Magre.
Advocate for R.No.3 : Mr.Abhishek Kulkarni.

...
CORAM: S.S. SHINDE & SANGITRAO S. PATIL, JJ.
Dated: AUGUST 12, 2016

...
Heard the learned Counsel for the
petitioners and the learned Counsel for
the respondents.

2. By way of filing this writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners are seeking directions to respondent No.2 to allow them to take admission against the vacant seats after Centralized Admission Process rounds are over and also for the seats remaining vacant at Institute level of Respondent No.3 – Institute to the courses run by it i.e. Master of Business Administration and Master of Computer Application, with directions to

respondents to grant Scholarship as per the scheme of the State Government.

3. While considering the similar contentions and prayers, this Court has rejected the Writ Petition No.7434 of 2016 with a reasoned order. The only difference is that the present petition has been filed by the students, who did not appear for the CET and they are desirous to take admission against the left out seats at the Institution level since the CAP rounds are likely to over by 14th August, 2016 and the Writ Petition No.7434 of 2016 was filed by the Everest Educational Society through its President.

4. We have considered almost same prayers and issues raised in the said writ petition and relying upon the judgment of the Supreme Court in case of **Visveswaraiah Technological University and another Vs. Krishnendu Halder and others**¹, and in particular, by recording the reasons in paragraph 8 to 10 of the said judgment, we have dismissed the said writ petition.

5. For the same reasons, which have been

¹ (2011) 4 SCC 606;

assigned in paragraphs 8 to 10 of the said judgment, this writ petition also stands rejected.

(SANGITRAO S. PATIL, J) (S.S. SHINDE, J)

kadam/