

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 8392 OF 2018

Narendra Rangrao Gajbhiye .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and another .. Respondents

Shri. H. H. Padalkar, Advocate for Petitioner.

Shri. S. B. Yawalkar, A.G.P. for Respondent/State.

**CORAM : S.V. GANGAPURWALA AND
SUNIL K. KOTWAL, JJ.**

DATED : 24th July, 2018

PER COURT:

. The petitioner assails the qualification enlisted in the advertisement and the order of the Tribunal dated 20th July 2018. Mr. Padalkar, learned counsel submits that the qualification prescribed by the respondent through corrigendum to the advertisement is not in consonance with the qualification under the Rules. The respondents could not have prescribed higher qualification for minimum eligibility than prescribed under the rules. The respondents be directed to call the

petitioner for interview. The petitioner possess the qualification as is required under the rules.

2. Mr. Pulkundwar, the learned Assistant Government Pleader on instructions submits that the advertisement was for one post of Administrative Officer and Official Trustee. One hundred and Eighteen candidates had applied. Only 10 persons could be called for interview in view of the ratio prescribed of 1:10. For the said purpose short listing is to be done and ten candidates are short listed who have experience of more than seventeen and half years. The petitioner has an experience of only thirteen and half years. Even he could not have been short listed.

3. The respondents can adopt the methodology for short listing the candidates. Certainly, the ratio will have to be maintained of 1 : 10. Out of 118 candidates only, ten could have been called for interview. As submitted by the respondents ten candidates called for interview have experience of more than seventeen and half years and the petitioner has experience of only thirteen and half years.

4. Even, if we accept the contention of the petitioner for the sake of argument that the petitioner is possessing minimum eligibility, still under

the criteria of short listing the petitioner could not have got place in a first ten candidates, who are called for interview.

5. In light of the above, no case for interference is made out. Writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

[SUNIL K. KOTWAL, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

ass/wp 8392.18