

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO. 6893 OF 2007

Bhagrati Digambar Bhale .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and another .. Respondents

Shri M. P. Kale, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Shri S. N. Morampalle, A.G.P. for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

None Present for respondent Nos. 3 and 4.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
MANGESH S. PATIL, JJ.**

DATE : 24TH AUGUST, 2017.

PER COURT :

. Mr. Kale, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, the respondent No. 5 and the petitioner had applied pursuant to the advertisement for the post of Anganwadi Supervisor. The petitioner was already working as Anganwadi Karyakarti since 1999, had the experience of seven years. According to the learned counsel, in view of the Clause D in the advertisement, preference was to be given to one who has worked for seven years as Anganwadi Sevika. According to the learned counsel, the respondent No. 5 has never worked as Anganwadi Sevika/Madatnis, as such, the petitioner ought to have been given preference.

2. It appears that, in the test written and oral, the petitioner secured 54 marks, whereas the respondent No. 5 has secured 56 marks. The preference would be given, if both are equal. In the present case, the respondent No. 5 was more meritorious and the same has been considered.

3. In the light of the above, no case for interference is made out. The writ petition is dismissed. Rule discharged. No costs.

[MANGESH S. PATIL, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

bsb/Aug. 17