

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

**REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO. 4 OF 2021
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 6368 OF 2019**

The General Manager,
(HR-MPP) Corporate Office,
Maharashtra State Electricity
Transmission Co. Ltd.
And another

.. Applicants

Versus

Dnyaneshwar Abhimanyu Wakade
and others

.. Respondents

Mr. S. V. Adwant, Advocate for the Applicants.
Mr. A. B. Chalak, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 1 to 3.
Mrs. P. V. Diggikar, AGP for Respondent No. 4.

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

DATED : 22nd JANUARY, 2021.

PER COURT:-

. Mr. Adwant, learned counsel for the applicants submits that the original petitioners at no point of time were appointed, nor the selection committee had occasion to consider these original writ petitioners as eligible for appointments. According to the learned counsel, the prayer of the petitioners was also to complete the selection process. The matter was never placed before the selection committee as well as before the appointing authority. They were only called for

document verification and by the time the documents could be verified after getting necessary information from their employers, the validity of the list came to an end.

2. We have also heard Mr. Chalak, learned counsel for the respondent Nos. 1 to 3.

3. We find that the present review on the grounds which are agitated would not affect the conclusion drawn in the judgment under review. We had never directed the present review applicants to directly appoint the petitioners on particular posts. After considering the pleadings and the submissions of the respective learned counsel, we had under the judgment sought to be reviewed only directed the respondent Nos. 2 and 3 to consider the candidature of the petitioners for appointments on the post of Surveyor Grade-II in view of the Rule 29 (a) of the Maharashtra State Electricity Board Classification and Recruitment Regulations, 1961, if they are otherwise found eligible for the said posts.

4. Pursuant to the order under review, we had never given blanket direction to the review applicants to appoint the petitioners. The eligibility is to be considered by the review applicants. We had observed in the order under review that it was inaction on the part of the present

review applicants not to extend the wait list. We had also further observed that there is no reason for the present review applicants to refuse to consider appointments of the respondents / original writ petitioners. We had considered that the original writ petitioners were not at fault because of the lapse of time. It is for the review applicants to consider the candidature of the petitioners, their eligibility for appointments, in accordance with rules and regulations.

5. In the light of the above, we do not find any case for review. Review application is rejected. No costs.

(SHRIKANT D. KULKARNI)
JUDGE

(S. V. GANGAPURWALA)
JUDGE

P.S.B.