

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 4180 OF 2017
(Krishnakumar S/o. Govind Kachawar Vs. The State of
Maharashtra and others)

Mr. S.B. Chavan, Advocate for the Petitioner
Mr. V.S. Badakh, A.G.P. for the respondent/State
Mr. G.S. Khaire, Advocate holding for Mr.S.S.Dande,
Advocate for respondent Nos. 2 to 4

CORAM : S.V. GANGAPURWALA AND
SANGITRAO S. PATIL, JJ.

DATE : 30th MARCH, 2017

PER COURT :

Heard.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that pursuant to the advertisement dated 1st July, 2017, the petitioner had applied for the post of Assistant to Anshakalin from open category. According to the learned counsel, the names of the candidates getting less marks than the petitioner have been shown in the provisional merit list; however, the name of the petitioner has not been depicted in the provisional merit list. The candidates namely Shaikh Mansur Kasim and Naikwade Rajesaheb Babasaheb have been shown in the provisional

merit list. Both these candidates have less marks than the petitioner. According to the learned counsel, there was no transparency in the selection process. The petitioner had also sought information under the Right to Information Act; however, the same has not been provided to the petitioner.

3. We have heard the learned A.G.P.

4. There is nothing on record to conclude that the candidates getting less marks than the petitioner have been selected. The selection process is pursuant to the advertisement published in July, 2014. The provisional merit list has also been published in March, 2015. The appointments must have been made by now. The persons who have been appointed are not parties before this Court. In absence of the said persons being arrayed as parties, no relief can be granted to the petitioner. Even otherwise, it is more than two years that the candidates are already appointed and the challenge is made at a very belated stage.

5. Considering all the aspects of the matter, no interference is warranted in the selection process

carried out by the respondents. In the result, the Writ
Petition is dismissed. No costs.

[SANGITRAO S. PATIL]
JUDGE

[S.V. GANGAPURWALA]
JUDGE

npj/wp4180-2017