

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 11278 OF 2017

Bagban Taufiq Shafi

.. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

.. Respondents

Shri Shaikh Mazar A. Jahagirdar, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Shri S. G. Karlekar, A.G.P. for the Respondent No. 1.

Shri Santosh S. Jadhavar, Advocate for the Respondent No. 2.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA AND
A. M. DHAVAL, JJ.**

DATE : 14TH FEBRUARY, 2018.

FINAL ORDER :

. Mr. Jahagirdar, the learned advocate for the petitioner submits that, the petitioner had appeared for diploma in Automobile Engineering examination. Upon declaration of result, the petitioner applied for verification of marks. Thereafter applied for reassessment. The reassessment was not done in accordance with the model answers. As such, the petitioner gave fresh representation, that has not been considered. The petitioner's answers as per model answers are required to be considered.

2. We have also heard Mr. Jadhavar, the learned advocate for

the respondent No. 2 and the learned Assistant Government Pleader for the respondent No. 1.

3. The petitioner had exhausted all the remedies. As per the rules, the petitioner had availed facilities of re-verification of marks. Thereafter reassessment of the paper. Even after reassessment of the paper, it was found that there was no change in the marks. Apart from above, no further relief can be granted to the petitioner. The representation is with regard to marks given to the petitioner. The petitioner's paper has been assessed and thereafter reassessed. The examiners in their wisdom have found the marks given to the petitioner as appropriate.

4. In the light of the above, no case for interference is made out. The writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

[A. M. DHAVAL, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]