

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 7710 OF 2016

Kai. Sushiladevi Gaikwad Bahuddeshiya
Sanstha and Another. ..Petitioners.

Versus

All India Council for Technical Education
and Others. ..Respondents.

Mr. S. R. Waghmare for the Petitioner.
Ms. A. D. Vhatkar, AGP for the State.

Coram : RANJIT MORE &
SMT. ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.
Date : **July 5, 2016.**

P. C. :

1. Heard. Mr. Waghmare, learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner at the outset makes a statement that the Petitioner is restricting this writ petition to the relief claimed in prayer clause (a) only. Prayer clause (a) reads thus :

“a. that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus or a writ in the nature of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, directing the 3rd and 4th Respondent to forthwith include Bio-medical Engg., and Electrical Engg, courses each with 60 intake of 2nd Petitioner college in the Centralised Admission Procedure (CAP) as per Approval dated 30-4-2016 granted by AICTE to the 2nd Petitioner for Extension of Approval for existing Engineering Courses for the academic year 2016-17 and to display the names of courses of Bio-medical Engg. and Electrical Engg. each with 60 intake of the 2nd Petitioner on its Web Portal to be listed alongwith institute information, course wise sanctioned intake and choice codes.”

2. Admittedly, the Petitioner – institute is running the engineering college since 2006-07 with the intake capacity of 60 each in mechanical and civil engineering with other branches. By the order dated 30th April 2016, the AICTE has granted extension of approval to the existing courses run by the Petitioner with the intake capacity of 60 each of bio-medical engineering and electrical engineering.

3. The grievance of the Petitioner is that despite approval by the expert body, Respondent Nos. 1, 2 and 3 are not including the name of the Petitioner – institute in the Centralised Admission Process for the said under-graduate courses.

4. Ms. Vhatkar, learned AGP having taken instructions from the Director who is present in the Court, states that the Petitioner – institute will be allowed to participate in the CAP for the academic year 2016-17. She has no objection for allowing the petition in terms of prayer clause (a). In the circumstances, we allow the writ petition in terms of prayer clause (a).

5. Writ petition stands disposed of.

[SMT. ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.]

[RANJIT MORE, J.]