

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

91 WRIT PETITION NO.1389 OF 2023

MOHAMMED MUZAMMIL MOHAMMAD ISMAIL ANSARI AND
OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH PRINCIPAL
SECRETARY AND OTHERS

.....
Advocate for Petitioners : Mr. Zia Ul Mustafa
AGP for Respondent No.1: Mr. P.S. Patil
Advocate for respondent No.2: Mr. S.G. Karlekar
.....

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE AND
SANJAY A. DESHMUKH, JJ.
DATED : 7th FEBRUARY, 2023.**

PER COURT :-

1. The petitioners are aspiring students, who desire to seek admission to the B.Ed. course with respondent No.4 College, operated by respondent No.3, minority institution.
2. This petition has been filed for seeking a Writ of Mandamus to the Commissioner and the Competent Authority, State Common Entrance Test Cell, Maharashtra State, Mumbai, to open the necessary portal and permit these petitioners to seek admission to the B.Ed. course, with respondent No.4 College, after the cut-off date. The cut-off date i.e. 30.12.2022, for admission, has already expired.
3. The contention is that these petitioners tried to opt for

respondent No.4 College on 27.12.2022 and 28.12.2022. However, due to a short period of time, allotted for uploading the options of colleges, these petitioners were unable to upload their options for selecting respondent No.4 College. It is prayed that this period now be extended, so as to enable the petitioners to apply and seek admission with respondent No.4 College.

4. It is well settled that when there are justifiable reasons, affecting large number of students, that certain orders have been passed by the authorities and in rare cases, by the Courts. It is beyond any debate that the courts should not monitor the admission process and should not direct extension of dates for grant of admissions to the students, unless in rare circumstances. In the instant case, merely because the petitioners could not opt for respondent No.4 college, cannot be a ground for entertaining this petition. The petitioners should have been more diligent and should have uploaded their options within the time prescribed.

5. In view of the above and as there are no satisfactory reasons, warranting interference of this court, this petition stands dismissed.

(SANJAY A. DESHMUKH, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE , J.)

rlj/