

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

**WRIT PETITION NO. 4761 OF 2020**

Rajesh Sominath Nilakha

.. Petitioner

Versus

The Union of India and others

.. Respondents

Mr. Ravindra V. Gore, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. R. B. Bhosale, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 1 to 5.

**CORAM : S. V. GANGAPURWALA &  
SHRIKANT D. KULKARNI, JJ.**

**DATED : 27<sup>th</sup> JULY, 2020.**

**PER COURT:-**

. The petitioner had applied for the post of Constable (GD) in the Central Armed Police Force pursuant to the advertisement. The petitioner was also called for the detailed medical examination. Subsequently, the respondents have rejected the candidature of the petitioner for the post of Constable (GD) on the ground that the petitioner has wrongly mentioned the place of Domicile District in his application submitted provisionally.

2. The learned counsel for the respondents relies on Clause 17 (17) of the SSC notification to contend that any mistake in mentioning the Domicile District entails disqualification. The petitioner has wrongly

mentioned the Domicile District in column no. 17 as Aurangabad, though he is domicile of Jalna.

3. According to Mr. Gore, learned counsel for the petitioner, the same was a bonafide mistake. In column no. 24 and 25 the petitioner has mentioned postal address and permanent address as Jalna.

4. It is not disputed that the petitioner was not to gain by writing domicile as Aurangabad instead of Jalna. In column no. 24 and 25 the petitioner has given postal and permanent address as of district Jalna. It appears that in column no. 17 the petitioner committed a bonafide mistake of mentioning district of domicile as Aurangabad. The petitioner's detailed medical examination was also conducted. It does not appear that petitioner had intention of misleading nor would gain any advantage by mentioning district of domicile as Aurangabad.

5. Considering the above, we pass the following order.

6. The impugned order disqualifying the petitioner is quashed and set aside.

7. In case, the petitioner is otherwise eligible, the respondents may not reject the candidature of the petitioner for the post of Constable (GD) only on the ground that the petitioner has wrongly mentioned his

District Domicile as Aurangabad in column no. 17 of the application.

8. Writ petition accordingly is disposed of. No costs.

( SHRIKANT D. KULKARNI )  
JUDGE

( S. V. GANGAPURWALA )  
JUDGE

PS.B.