

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

**940 REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO.59 OF 2019  
IN WP/4644/2018**

MANOJ MADHUKARRAO KANNAWAR

..APPLICANT

VERSUS

THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS ..RESPONDENTS

...

Mr. Shrikant Krishnarao Patil, Advocate for the Applicant.

Mr. V. M. Kagne, AGP for Respondents-State.

Mr. V. R. Sonwalkar, Advocate for Respondent No.3.

...

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &  
AVINASH G. GHAROTE, JJ.**

**DATED : 22<sup>nd</sup> NOVEMBER, 2019.**

**PER COURT:-**

1. Mr. Patil, learned counsel for the applicant submits that at the time of disposal of the writ petition, the petitioner could not bring to the notice of the Court the order passed in the Writ Petition Nos.9594/2016 and 9097/2016, wherein this Court had considered that if the candidate is possessing qualification of Extension Officer, he ought to have considered for the post of Extension Officer.

2. We had under our judgment and order considered the Government Resolution dated 23.08.1996. As per the said Government Resolution the petitioner can be appointed on Class-C or

Class-D post as per the qualification. If the petitioner is possessing qualification of Class-C, but because of the non-availability of the vacancy is appointed on Class-D post, then whenever post of Class C becomes vacant, he has to be considered on the post of Class-C. In the present case the petitioner is already appointed on Class-C post. However, now claims that the appointment be given on another Class-C post, the same is not purport of the Government Resolution dated 23.08.1996.

3. In the light of above, no case for review is made out. Review Application is rejected. No costs.

**(AVINASH G. GHAROTE)**  
**JUDGE**

**(S. V. GANGAPURWALA)**  
**JUDGE**