

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

1025 WRIT PETITION NO.6981 OF 2021

**SUVARNA SHIVAJI CHIMANSHETTE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS**

...

Advocate for Petitioner: Mr. Kadam Vishal S
AGP for Respondent No. 1: Mr. S. P. Tiwari
Advocate for Respondents No. 2&3: Mr. A. S. Bajaj

...

**CORAM: S. V. GANGAPURWALA &
R. N. LADDHA, JJ.**

DATE: 20th AUGUST, 2021

PER COURT:

1. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had applied from General (Women) category and not from Apprentice category. Inadvertently, while filling in the application the mistake was committed and it was stated that the petitioner has completed apprentice through MSEDCL. The same was a mistake. The learned Advocate submits that the petitioner is also shown to have been selected from General (Women) category, still, the candidature of the petitioner is not considered by the respondents.

2. Mr. Bajaj, the learned Advocate submits that the petitioner's application for the wrong information submitted could not have been accepted. The petitioner in the application at 2 places represented that she has completed apprenticeship with MSEDCL. The petitioner does not have the experience as required under the Advertisement.

3. We have considered the submissions canvassed the learned Advocates for respective parties.

4. The petitioner while filling in the application form has categorically represented that the petitioner has successfully completed the apprenticeship from MSEDCL. The petitioner also while providing the work experience details has again represented that the petitioner has completed apprenticeship from MSEDCL from 14.10.2016 to 13.10.2018. The petitioner in the present petition has produced the apprenticeship certificate from Fiat India Automobiles Pvt. Ltd. stating that the petitioner has completed

apprenticeship with Fiat India Automobiles Pvt. Ltd. from 14.10.2016 to 13.10.2017 and subsequently worked as an Electrician with Fiat India Automobiles Pvt. Ltd. from 14.10.2017 to 03.04.2018. The petitioner in the present writ petition has produced another experience certificate of work as an Operator from 01.07.2018 to 20.07.2019 with a private establishment. There is no doubt that the petitioner misrepresented that she has completed apprenticeship from MSEDCL from 14.10.2016 to 13.10.2018 and whereas for the said period the petitioner was undergoing the apprenticeship with Fiat India Automobiles Pvt. Ltd. from 14.10.2016 to 13.10.2017. The experience of apprenticeship cannot be considered as per Clause 3.1 of the Advertisement. Two years experience is required after the apprenticeship is completed. The petitioner completed that apprenticeship as per the certificate produced by the petitioner on 13.10.2017.

5. The petitioner has produced the experience certificate of an Electrician for the period

14.10.2017 to 03.04.2018 and 01.07.2018 to 20.07.2019. The said experience would be of 1½ year after completing apprenticeship. The same does not comply with Clause 3.1 of the Advertisement.

6. Any experience certificate after the date of Advertisement would be of no help to the petitioner.

7. Taking the case either way, the petitioner does not have the necessary experience.

8. Writ Petition as such is disposed of. No costs.

[R. N. LADDHA, J.]

[S. V. GANGAPURWALA, J.]

marathe