

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 3283 OF 2013

Daivashala D/o. Ramdas Chole @
Smt. Daivashala W/o. Shivshankar Lamb
Age-27 years, Occu. : Household,
R/o. Gopalpur, Shikshak Colony,
Tq. Dharur, Dist. Beed

.. Petitioner

Versus

- 1] The State of Maharashtra,
Through the Secretary of
Woman & Child Development Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai – 32
- 2] The Child Development Project Officer i.e.
The Secretary of Taluka Selection Committee,
Integrated Child Development Scheme Project,
Dharur, Tq. Dharur, Dist. Beed
- 3] Smt. Mangal W/o. Prakashrao Solanke,
Age – Major, Occu : Business & Household,
R/o. Near Gajanan Maharaj Temple,
Bazar Road, Majalgaon,
Tq. Majalgaon, Dist. Beed
- 4] Megha D/o. Murlidharrao Joshi @
Megha W/o. Vaijanath Deshmukh,
Age-35 years, Occu. : Service,
R/o. Aadhar, Shikshak Colony,
Gopalpur, Tq. Dharur, Dist. Beed

- 5] CEO, Zilha Parishad,
Beed, Dist. Beed

.. Respondents

...

Mr. S.J. Salunke, Advocate for petitioner
Mr. S.N. Rodge, Advocate for respondent no. 4
Mrs. D.S. Jape, AGP for respondent – State
Mr. A.D. Aghav, Advocate for respondent no. 5

...

CORAM : SUNIL P. DESHMUKH &
B.U. DEBADWAR, JJ.
DATE : 04-03-2020

ORAL JUDGMENT (PER – SUNIL P. DESHMUKH, J.) :

1. Rule. Rule made returnable forthwith. Heard learned counsel for appearing parties finally, by consent.
2. Under present writ petition, petitioner purports to put up appointment of respondent no. 4 as Anganwadi Karyakarti (Helper) at stake, contending that respondent no. 4 had been less meritorious than the petitioner and that her appointment had been under political influence.
3. The petitioner had secured 67 marks and respondent no. 4 had secured 65 marks and were declared candidates eligible for interview. In interview, petitioner had secured 5.75 marks and respondent no. 4 had secured 8.25 marks. It also emerges that petitioner to have secured only 62 marks instead of 67. Even going by simple mathematics, the situation is unlikely to enure to benefit of the petitioner since $65 + 8.25 = 73.25$ are the marks secured by respondent no. 4 and $67 + 5.75 = 72.75$ are the marks secured by petitioner. As such, respondent no. 4 appears to have secured higher marks and has been accordingly selected and appointed. This situation would not be met with by any amount of politics and the politics involved has not been explained in the petition.

The allegation appears to have been made cursorily in order to seek support in writ petition.

4. Even otherwise, the marks given by members of interviewing panel so far as respondent no. 4 is concerned, they are higher than the marks given to the petitioner.

5. We do not see that the allegations with regard to political influence carry any substance.

6. The writ petition accordingly is dismissed. Rule is discharged.

[B.U. DEBADWAR]
JUDGE

[SUNIL P. DESHMUKH]
JUDGE

arp/