

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 12192 OF 2018

Pratiksha Dnyanoba Mane

.. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra and others

.. Respondents

Shri Mahendra P. Gandale, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Shri P. S. Patil, Addl.G.P. for the Respondent No. 1.

Shri M. D. Narwadkar, Advocate for the Respondent No. 2.

Mrs. Anjali Bajpai-Dube, Advocate for the Respondent No. 3 –
absent.

Shri Sachin S. Deshmukh, Advocate for the Respondent No. 4

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

DATE : 22ND JANUARY, 2019.

FINAL ORDER :

. Mr. Gandale, the learned advocate for the petitioner submits that, the petitioner has passed CET examination for LLB three year course and provisional admission was also given. The same is cancelled on the ground that the petitioner has not passed 10 + 2 + 3 sequential pattern. Preparatory exam passed by the petitioner is equivalent to 12th for service purpose. The same analogy can be applied for educational purpose also.

2. Mr. Deshmukh and Mr. Narwadkar, the learned counsel

for respective respondents submit that, for the petitioner to be eligible to get admission in Law course, the petitioner has to possess 10 + higher secondary passing certificate or Ist year degree certificate. As the petitioner has not passed in sequential manner, it cannot be considered.

3. This Court in Writ Petition No. 9118 of 2018 under judgment dated 10.10.2018 has considered said aspect. It was held that, passing of exam of 10 + 2 + degree sequential manner is essential for three year LLB course. There is nothing on record to show that preparatory is made equivalent to 12th pass for the purpose of admission and for the purpose of academics. Equivalence for the purpose of service cannot be considered in the present case.

4. In the light of the above, grievance of the petitioner cannot be considered. The writ petition as such is disposed of. No costs.

[A. M. DHAVAL, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

bsb/Jan. 19