

FARAD CONTINUATION SHEET NO.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

APPELLATE SIDE, BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO.10396 OF 2015**Sandip S/o Ashokpuri Gosavi Vs. The State of Maharashtra
and others.**

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

Mr.N.L.Choudhari, advocate for the petitioner.
 Mr.V.H.Dighe, A.G.P.for the State.
 Mr.N.S.Choudhari, advocate for Respondent Nos.2 and 3.

**CORAM : S.V.GANGAPURWALA AND
K.L.WADANE, JJ.**

Date : 21.09.2016.

PER COURT :

1. Heard.

2. Mr.N.L.Choudhari, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that large scale illegalities have been committed in the selection process for the post of Education Development Officer. Pursuant to the advertisement, the petitioner had applied from NT-B category. It was shown that the petitioner has secured 98 marks. The petitioner possesses all the necessary qualification. The Respondent Nos.2 and 3 have published list of only 33 candidates to be called for interview, however, the name of the petitioner did not appear in the said list. The Respondent Nos.2 and 3 kept marks

allotted to the candidates secret by not displaying the marks as against the names of the candidates.

3. Mr.N.S.Choudhari, learned counsel for Respondent Nos.2 and 3 submits that the petitioner has applied from NT-B category for the post of Education Development Officer. The petitioner secured 98 marks out of 180. However, the cut off marks determined were 122.5 for the persons applying from NT-B category. As the petitioner has secured much less marks than the cut off marks, the candidature of the petitioner could not be considered.

4. We have considered the submissions. The Respondents have filed affidavit clarifying the marks allotted to the petitioner and the cut off marks. The petitioner it appears was much below the cut off marks. Certainly, the persons below the cut off marks could not have been considered.

5. In view of the above, the grievance of the petitioner can not be considered. The Writ Petition is disposed of. No costs.

(K . L . WADANE , J .)

(S . V . GANGAPURWALA , J .)

Dt.21.09.2016.
asp/office/wp10396.15

