

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

WRIT PETITION NO. 1405 OF 2016

Pravin Bapurao Warghat

-vs-

Commissioner, Municipal Corporation, Amravati and another

 Office notes, Office Memoranda of
 Coram, appearances, Court's orders
 or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders.

 None for the petitioner.

CORAM : SMT. VASANTI A NAIK &
MRS. SWAPNA JOSHI, JJ.

DATE : 08.08.2016.

Since none appeared on behalf of the petitioner in the morning session, the matter was kept back. None appears on behalf of the petitioner in the afternoon session also.

By this writ petition, the petitioner has sought a direction to the respondent No.1 to revise the answer key and set aside the interview as also the process initiated by the respondent No.1 in pursuance of the advertisement for appointment to the post of Law Officer.

The petitioner had applied for the post of Law Officer in pursuance of an advertisement issued by the Municipal Corporation, Amravati. The petitioner had appeared at the written examination on 23.10.2015 and the result was declared on the same day. According to the petitioner, in view of the wrongful answers supplied to question Nos.44, 87, 142, 159 and 179, the petitioner was not declared successful. It is the case of the petitioner that the answers to the aforesaid five questions have been wrongly mentioned in the answer key. The petitioner, has therefore sought the cancellation of the selection process in view of the wrongful answers supplied in the answer key to the five aforesaid questions.

We are not inclined to grant the relief sought by the petitioner in this writ petition. The petitioner had secured 114 marks

and the last candidate that was interviewed by the Committee had secured 115 marks. The case of the petitioner that he would have secured 119 marks and would have been entitled to appear at the interview, had the answers being correctly stated in the answer key cannot be considered in exercise of the writ jurisdiction. Since the petitioner was not found to be meritorious, his claim was not considered. It would not be possible, in exercise of the writ jurisdiction to direct the respondent No.1 to revalue the answer papers of all the candidates by correcting the answer key. It is not the case of the petitioner that the answer key was wrongly prepared with a view to favour the selected candidates.

In the circumstances, we dismiss the writ petition with no order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE

KHUNTE

C E R T I F I C A T E

I certify that this Order uploaded is a true and correct copy of original signed Order.

Uploaded by : G.S.Khunte,
P.A.to Hon'ble Judge

Uploaded on : 11/08/2016