

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 14077 OF 2022

Shri. Gorakhnath Uddhav Ingole .. Petitioner
v/s.
State of Maharashtra and Ors. .. Respondents

...

Mr. B.G. Ligade, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Mr. R.P. Kadam, AGP for Respondent no.1.
Mr. Hassan Khan, Advocate for Respondent no.2.

...

CORAM : NITIN JAMDAR, &
SANDEEP V. MARNE, JJ.

Dated : 1 August 2023.

P.C. :

1. Heard learned Counsel for the parties.
2. The Petitioner is seeking to quash the order dated 23 August 2019 issued by Respondent no.2.
3. For selection in the year 2014, the Respondent no.2 called for applications for appointment on contract basis on the post of Sub-station Assistant (Upkendra Sahayyak). The Petitioner was not given an appointment on contract

basis. Therefore, the Petitioner filed Writ Petition in this Court bearing No. 6138/2018 which was disposed of permitting the Petitioner to file a representation, which representation was rejected by the impugned order. The impugned order states that the Petitioner had given different age than what his documents would show and going by the documents, the Petitioner was age barred.

4. The learned Counsel for the Petitioner submitted that even though the advertisement had stipulated age limit as 27 years, those who were working with Respondent no.2 and had completed the necessary training, there was relaxation of age limit and also those who were working with the Respondent no.2 and were found eligible, age limit would not apply. The learned Counsel submitted that therefore the decision of Respondent no.2 of not granting the appointment on contract basis on the ground of being age barred, is contrary to the advertisement and necessary directions be issued. The learned Counsel submits that the Petitioner is working with Respondent no.2 as of today as 'Outsourcing Operator'.

5. The petition pertains to the Petitioner's application for appointment on contract basis as 'Sub-Station

Assistant'. This process was initiated in the year 2014. It is informed by learned Counsel for Respondent no.2, it was for appointment on contract basis for three years. He further states that another process was initiated for appointment on contract basis, which is also over. Therefore, as regards the appointment on the post of Sub-Station Assistant, no effective relief can be granted to the Petitioner as this process has been long over.

5. Keeping all contentions of the Petitioner open, in case the issue arises in the subsequent selection process, we dispose of the present Writ Petition.

SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.

NITIN JAMDAR, J.