

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE CIVIL JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.10246 OF 2014**

Raviraj Shrirang Kalbhor .. Petitioner
vs
The Maharashtra State Electricity Transmission
Company Ltd (Mahatransco) & anr .. Respondents

Mr.S.S.Kulkarni for Petitioner
Ms.Savita A.Prabhune for Respondent no.1
Mr.V.N.Sagare Asst.Govt.Pleader for Respondent no.2

...
CORAM: **ANOOP V.MOHTA AND**
G.S.KULKARNI, JJ
DATE: **2ND MARCH 2016**

ORDER:

1. The Petitioner has filed this Petition and prayed for directions against Respondent no.1 to call for and hold interviews on the posts of Deputy Executive Engineer (Transmission) in pursuance to Employment Advertisement No.01/2014. The Respondents have filed an Affidavit opposing the same on various grounds and specifically that as the Petitioner does not possess the experience as required and specifically advertised on a pre-requisite qualification i.e. “7 years experience in power transmission”. Learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner has relied upon the Experience Certificate dated 2 June, 2014 in support of his submissions that he has the experience and this experience is sufficient to

fall within the ambit of experience which they require in Power Transmission. A reference is also made to the various provisions of the Indian Electricity Act, 1910.

2. After hearing both the parties including the averments so made by the Respondents based upon the Expert's decision with regard to experience as required, they found that the Petitioner does not possess the requisite experience in Power Transmission. Thus the averments/Affidavit in our view, is sufficient to dismiss the present Petition as the Respondents the Appointing Authority having decided to appoint a person to fill in the post of Deputy Executive Engineer based upon their requirements including that of 7 years experience in Power Transmission and having once taken the decision that the Petitioner does not possess the said Power Transmission experience, the scope of writ jurisdiction is restricted in such matter and therefore, there is no case to grant any relief as prayed. Petition is dismissed.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner seeks continuation of the statement so recorded, for a further period of four

weeks. Considering the facts and reasons so recorded, we see no reason made out for continuation of the statement. On the contrary, the posts have still remained to be filled in till this date. Therefore, no case for stay of the order. Rejected accordingly.

G.S.KULKARNI, J

ANOOP V.MOHTA J

