

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

(1)

WP NO.12176/2015

934 WRIT PETITION NO. 12176 OF 2015

DEEPAK GANPAT CHOOTHMAL AND ANOTHER
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...
AGP for Respondent State: Mr. P.G.Borade
Mr.Tope Sambhaji S., Adv., for R/3 and 4.

...
CORAM : S.S. SHINDE & P.R. BORA, JJ.
Dated: February 08, 2016

...
PER COURT :-

1. None appears for the petitioner. Counsel appearing for respondent nos. 3 and 4, on instructions, submits that the petitioner applied for the selection process which was commenced in the year 2014; same was completed in the said year and in pursuance to the said selection process, appointments were given to the candidates. Thereafter, in the year 2015, there was new selection process undertaken by the respondents and even that selection process is over and appointments are given. Therefore, according to the Counsel appearing for respondent no.2, since the reliefs claimed in the petition relate back to the year 2014, no relief can be granted in this petition.

2. Though the petition was called out in the morning session, no one represented the petitioners. Even in the afternoon session, none appears for the petitioner. Keeping in view the submissions made across the Bar by the Counsel -

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

(2)

WP NO.12176/2015

appearing for respondent nos. 3 and 4, and the fact that the petitioner participated in the selection process for the year 2014 and the said selection process has been culminated into issuing appointments to the selected candidates and thereafter also, fresh selection process was undertaken in the year 2015 and that has also been acted upon.

3. No case is made out to entertain this petition. The Writ Petition stands rejected.

(P.R. BORA, J.)

(S.S. SHINDE, J.)

...