



not entitled to receive any foreign scholarship as per the Scheme formulated by the State of Maharashtra, which is an error of fact patently seen from the record of the case.

3. In support of his argument, the learned counsel for the petitioner invites our attention to the admission letter and relevant clauses of the Government Resolution dated 30.06.2018.

4. On consideration of the submissions of the petitioner and the documents relied upon, we find that the petitioner is pleading a new case, not pleaded in the petition and argued at the time of final hearing.

5. The course being studied by the petitioner is M.Sc. in Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship, as it appears from the impugned order dated 04.11.2020 that this course has been considered to be a course similar to M.B.A. and since this course was of less than two years duration, the respondent no.3 found that the petitioner was not eligible for receiving foreign scholarship in terms of Clause 6.1 of the Government Resolution dated 30.06.2018. This was also one of the conditions of the advertisement inviting applications for grant of foreign scholarship. Condition No.31 of the advertisement in question clarified that the foreign scholarship scheme would not be applicable to that M.B.A. course which is less than of two years duration. The petitioner never pleaded nor argued in the petition that the M. Sc. course in Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship to which the petitioner has been admitted by the London School of Economics was not equivalent to M.B.A. course. In fact, the admission letter issued to the petitioner shows that this course conducted by the Department of Management of London School of Economics pertains to

development of business sense in social innovation and entrepreneurial skills and considering these aspects that the respondent no.3 took a decision that this course which was quite akin to M.B.A. was not eligible for grant of foreign scholarship. In this backdrop, it became necessary for the petitioner to plead a specific case that M. Sc. is a course not equivalent to M.B.A. course and also to make specific prayer to that effect. On these counts, there was a failure on the part of the petitioner. The petitioner also did not make submissions on these lines. Now, a new case is being averred by the petitioner to point out some deficiency in the judgment, which in the opinion of the petitioner is an error apparent on the face of the record which, in fact, is not, against the background of facts and circumstances just noted.

6. When it was never the case of the petitioner that her course was not equivalent to M.B.A. course, there could not have been any consideration of the same and thus there could not have been any commission of error by this Court. There is no substance in the review application. The review application stands rejected.

(ANIL S. KILOR, J.)

(SUNIL B. SHUKRE, J.)

*Andurkar..*