

3. On 7th October, 2022, a provisional list of eligible candidates in the first CAP round was published. It is the Petitioner's grievance that the Petitioner's name did not find mention therein. Upon being inquired, the Petitioner was verbally instructed that the facilitation centre system was closed and no more data could be uploaded.

4. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that as per the notice dated 21st September, 2022, the Petitioner could lodge the grievance with the facilitation center and submit the documents during the period 8th October, 2022 to 10th October, 2022 upto 5.00 p.m. On 8th October, 2022 the Petitioner addressed an email to Respondent No.4 and sought permission to verify the documents and allow her to appear for CAP round. However, the Petitioner was unjustifiably denied the said opportunity.

5. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner further submitted that overarching principle is admission based on merit. Thus, on account of mere technicalities, a bright student should not be deprived of an opportunity to participate in the admission process.

6. We have considered the submissions of the learned Counsel for the Petitioner.

7. The admission notice makes it abundantly clear that the mandatory activity of 'Documents verification and confirmation of Application Form', was to be

carried out during 21st September, 2022 to 4th October, 2022 upto 6.00 p.m. We find that the communication dated 8th October, 2022 itself records that the Petitioner could not verify the documents in accordance with Clause 2 of the Schedule appended to the notice dated 21st September, 2022. The Petitioner has ascribed reason of 'medical emergency'. We must note that it is specifically mentioned in the Note below clause 2 that 'Applications registered after 4th October, 2022 shall be considered only for non-CAP seats'. Likewise, 'Applications confirmed by facilitation center after 4th October, 2022 shall be considered only for non-CAP seats'. Respondent No.4 was, thus, justified in declining to have the verification of the documents post declaration of provisional eligibility list.

8. Reliance on clause 4 of the Schedule, in our view, does not advance the cause of the Petitioner as the grievances contemplated therein, prima facie, pertain to the preceding activity i.e. display of the final merit list of Maharashtra State/All India candidates on website (clause 3).

9. We are, therefore, not inclined to entertain the Writ Petition.

10. The Writ Petition stands dismissed.

(SHARMILA U. DESHMUKH, J.)

(N.J.JAMADAR, J.)