

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

WRIT PETITION NO.13841 OF 2023

**BHARTI PRATAPSING TADVI
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THR THE SECRETARY
AND ORS**

...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Shri Jain Gajendra Devichand
AGP for Respondents 1 and 4/State : Shri V.M. Kagne
Advocate for Respondents 2 and 3 : Shri A.R. Nikam
...

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE
&
Y. G. KHOBRADE, JJ.**

DATE :- 01st November, 2023

Per Court :-

1. The Petitioner submits that she is qualified to be registered on the Pavitra Portal.
2. Shri Nikam, the learned Advocate representing Respondent Nos.2 and 3/ Examination Council submits that, earlier, the deadline was extended from 15.09.2023 to 30.09.2023 and thereafter, it was extended for a limited purpose to upload certain documents, upto 06.10.2023. It is specifically submitted that it would be an endless exercise to continue to extend these dates and the entire selection process would never be completed.

He further submits that this Court should refrain from issuing a Writ of Mandamus for extending the dates.

3. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits that this Court may grant time to enable the Petitioner to tender her e-mail for registering on the Pavitra Portal.

4. The learned AGP submits that earlier, the grievance was that the Pavitra Portal process for recruitment is not adopted frequently. Now, the registration on the Pavitra Portal is in progress and after extending the deadline twice, the verification of the names of the candidates is underway. Any further indulgence of this Court would amount to continuing the entire process endlessly.

5. Having considered the submissions of the learned Advocates for the respective sides, we do not find it appropriate to grant yet another extension for registration of the candidates. Such extensions have occurred on two occasions. The verification of documents has been undertaken by the Authorities. By the indulgence of the Court, if the dates are extended, it would practically render the entire process endless and the process would never be completed.

6. In view of the above, we do not find that we could

issue orders in the nature of a Writ of Mandamus to the Authorities to further extend the period. **This Writ Petition is, therefore, disposed off.**

7. At this juncture, the learned Advocate for the Petitioner submits that there is some preference granted to the candidates from the PESA.

8. Shri Nikam, the learned Advocate, refutes the said contention.

9. As such, in the event of any such advantage/concession statutorily available, the Authorities may consider the case of the Petitioner.

kps

(Y. G. KHOBRADE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)