

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

**REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO. 3 OF 2021
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 6471 OF 2019**

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

.. Applicants

Versus

Kailas Manohar Gaikwad

.. Respondent

Mr. S. V. Adwant, Advocate for the Applicants.
Mr. A. B. Chalak, Advocate for sole Respondent.

**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 petitioner at no point of time was appointed, nor the selection committee had occasion to consider this original writ petitioner as eligible for appointment. According to the learned counsel, the prayer of the petitioner 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 original writ petitioner.

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 petitioner on a particular post. 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 petitioner for appointment 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 he is otherwise found eligible for the said post.

4. Pursuant to the order under review, we had never given blanket direction to the review applicants to appoint the petitioner. 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 appointment of the respondent / original writ petitioner. We had considered that the original writ petitioner was not at fault because of the lapse of time. It is for the review applicants to consider the candidature of the petitioner, his eligibility for appointment, 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.