

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

WRIT PETITION (L) NO. 2889 OF 2018

Vineet Kumar MeenaPetitioner
V/s.
Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai and anr.Respondents

Mr. Govind B. Solanke for the petitioner.
Mr. Milind Sathe, Sr. Advocate a/w. Mr. Parag Sharma a/w.
Ms. Aditi Phatak and Ms. Priya Mehra i/b. M/s. Udadia & Co.
for the respondents.

**CORAM : AKIL KURESHI AND
S.J. KATHAWALLA, JJ.**

DATED : 04th JULY, 2019.

P.C.:-

. The petitioner's grievance is that despite he having passed the written examination conducted by the respondents for the post of Assistant in the Reserve Bank of India, he was not offered appointment. Apparently, this was because the biometric of the petitioner did not match when the respondents called him for such purpose only upon which the appointment order would be issued. The petitioner does not dispute that the biometric failed to match. The respondents have filed their affidavit pointing out interalia that the biometric of the petitioner was captured at the time of the main examination. Since the petitioner had secured sufficient marks, he

would be offered appointment. For such purpose, like all other candidates, the petitioner was also called for capturing biometric for the purpose of verification. In case of the petitioner, the same was done for the first time on 26/02/2018. Since the petitioner's biometric verification was not successful, he was called again for such purpose on 07/03/2018 on which date also the petitioner's biometric did not match with that of the original captured before the main examination. The petitioner has not averred malafides. The petitioner, therefore, as per the policy of the respondents cannot be offered appointment. The averments made in the affidavit-in-reply are undeniable. The petitioner does not dispute that he was called for biometric verification twice and on both occasions, the same failed to match with the originals. Under the circumstances, we have no reason to interfere by issuing the writ of mandamus as prayed by the petitioner.

2. Petition is, therefore, disposed of.

(S.J. KATHAWALLA, J.)

(AKIL KURESHI, J.)