

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 617 of 2015

Retd. ACP-Shinde Sarjerao MahadevPetitioner
versus
Dr. Rajeshree Vharadi and ors.Respondents

with

WRIT PETITION NO. 3048 of 2015

Retd. ACP-Shinde Sarjerao MahadevPetitioner
versus
Cabinet Minister, Higher Education to
Government of Maharashtra and ors.Respondents

Mr. S. M. Shinde, petitioner-in-person present.
Ms. Rimi Jain I/b. Mr. Rui Rodrigues, advocate for the respondent Nos.2
and 3.
Mr. Milind V. More, AGP for the State.

**CORAM : RANJIT MORE &
SMT.ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, JJ.**

DATE : 9th JULY, 2018.

P. C. :

Heard the petitioner-in-person and Ms. Rimi Jain, learned
counsel for the respondent No.2 and 3.

2. By filing these petitions under Article 226 of the Constitution
of India, the petitioner is taking an exception to his non-selection for
admission in Ph.D. Course. The petitioner has also challenged the
selection of one Pallavi Murkute for the said course. At this stage, no

order can be passed against said Pallavi Murkute, since the petitioner has not impleaded her as party respondent.

3. Be that as it may, the record reveals that the procedure for admission for Ph.D includes an Entrance Exam comprising of Ph.D. Entrance Test (PET) Written Exam of 100 marks and Ph.D. Oral Interview of 50 marks. However, the students who possess M.Phil Degree are exempted from appearing for the PET Written Exam and can apply directly for the Ph.D. Oral Interview. The petitioner has already obtained M.Phil Degree and, therefore, he was exempted from appearing for PET Written Exam and was allowed to appear for the Oral Interview. The Committee of experts comprising of Justice J. N. Patel, former Chief Justice of Calcutta High Court and 6 other persons was constituted for conducting the oral interviews. Accordingly, the interviews were conducted and four candidates came to be selected considering their knowledge, communication skills, presentation and research aptitude. For our subjective satisfaction, we have perused the result sheet of the said interviews. Perusal of the same, reveals that the petitioner was not qualified as he did not obtain minimum marks set out as benchmark and hence, he was not selected. We do not find any material in support of allegation of bias against the petitioner. The petitions are devoid of any merits and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.

4. In view of dismissal of the petitions, notice of motion/chamber summons, if any, will not survive for consideration and the same are also disposed of.

[SMT.ANUJA PRABHUDESSAI, J.]

[RANJIT MORE, J.]