

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 4281 OF 2015

(Ravikumar Vijayrao Chandan & Ors. vs. Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company
Ltd. thr. its MD)

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

Court's or Judge's orders.

**CORAM : B.P. DHARMADHIKARI &
P.N. DESHMUKH, JJ.
APRIL 05, 2016.**

Heard Shri V.B. Bhise, learned counse. for the petitioner and Shri A.D. Mohgaonkar, learned counsel for the respondent.

This Court has on earlier occasion disposed of Writ Petition No. 121 of 2015 on 15.04.2015 by passing the following order :

“Submission of Mr. V.B. Bhise, learned Advocate for petitioners, is that selection to the post of Junior Technician could not be on the basis of marks obtained in S.S.C. or H.S.C. but marks obtained in Technical Trade or Diploma course must be given precedence.

Mr. A.D. Mohgaonkar, learned Advocate for respondent, disputes this.

During arguments, we find that petitioners are Wiremen and for admission to that course, 8th standard is the only requirement.

The selection process is still going on and select list has not been prepared.

The impact of arguments can be appreciated after

the selection list becomes available. Mr. V.B. Bhise, learned Advocate for petitioners, therefore, seeks leave to withdraw with liberty to approach after such selection list is declared, if any grievance accrues at that stage.

Mr. A.D. Mohgaonkar, learned Advocate for respondent, is opposing grant of any liberty.

However, in this situation, as we find that the contention of learned Counsel for the petitioners, can be appreciated qua the different candidates whose names figure in select list and their performance in different examinations, we grant leave as prayed for by Mr. V.B. Bhise, learned Advocate for petitioners.

Writ Petition is accordingly disposed of as withdrawn with the liberty.”

Now, the selection list has been published and the petitioners before this Court have come up with same contentions.

In petition as filed, there is no challenge to norms for recruitment or to any terms and conditions stipulated in the advertisement. The advertisement itself is of the year 2014 and more than a period of two years have passed. Not only this, the petitioners have also participated in pursuance thereof.

In this situation, we find no case made out warranting intervention in writ jurisdiction. Writ Petition is dismissed. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

JUDGE

JUDGE