

Urmila Ingale

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 12055 OF 2016

Mr.Pradnyesh Bajrang Mane .. Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra and ors. .. Respondents

Mr.S.M.Oak a/w Mr.Sagar A.Joshi, for the Petitioner.
Ms.Nisha Mehra, AGP for State.
Ms.Sheila Kanugo, Hon.General Secretary, Maharashtra Rifle Association.
Mr.Shaikh Gani – Respondent No. 8 present in-person.
Mrs.Sneha Narkar, Respondent No. 9 present in-person.

**CORAM : SHANTANU.S.KEMKAR &
M.S.KARNIK, JJ.
DATE : 21st OCTOBER, 2016**

P.C. :

. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner on the question of admission.

2. By filing this Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner is seeking quashment of the selection of respondents No. 5, 6 & 7 to represent Pune Zone at Maharashtra State Level Shooting Competition. Learned AGP

appearing for the State submits that the petitioner is challenging the competence of 8th & 9th respondents to be the Judges of the State competition, whereas, the petitioner had participated in the same competition in the years 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 and thereafter in the present competition also. In the earlier years, he never objected to the competence of the private respondents No. 8 & 9 to be the Judges of the State competition. However, in this present competition, when he stood 5th, then only he raised the grievance and seeking aforesaid direction.

3. Having considered the submissions made by the learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned AGP, we are of the view that no interference at the instance of the present petitioner who have participated in the earlier years and in this year also in the competition without raising any objection is not entitled for grant of any relief claimed in the Petition. However, as regards the competence of respondents No. 8 & 9 as doubted by respondent No.3, we are not dealing with the issue since we are dismissing the Petition of the petitioner on the ground that

he having been participated in the selection process could not turn around and raise grievance.

4. The Petition fails and hereby dismissed.

(M.S.KARNIK, J.)

(SHANTANU.S.KEMKAR, J.)