

Pdp

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

PRAVIN
DASHARATH
PANDIT

WRIT PETITION NO. 553 OF 2020

Digitally signed by
PRAVIN DASHARATH
PANDIT

Date: 2023.04.24
20:27:59 +0530

Sarvade Anuja Dhondiram

.. Petitioner

Versus

State of Maharashtra & Ors.

.. Respondents

Mr. Atul Damle, Senior Advocate a/w Mr. Jagdish G. Aradwad (Reddy) a/w Ms. Ashwini B. Jadhav for petitioner.
Mr. Sukanta Karmakar, AGP for respondent no.1/State.
Mr. Abhijeet Joshi a/w Ms. Varsha Sawant for respondent nos.2 and 3.

**CORAM: S. V. GANGAPURWALA, ACTING CJ. &
SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.**

DATE: APRIL 24, 2023

P.C.:

1. Mr. Damle, learned senior advocate for the petitioner submits the petitioner, pursuant to the Advertisement No.3 of 2018, applied for the post of Assistant Law Officer from Scheduled Caste category. As per the advertisement, there were total two vacancies. One was meant for general category and another for Scheduled Caste category. The post for general category is filled in but the respondent has not filled in the post for Scheduled Caste category. The petitioner was standing at Sr. No. 1 from Scheduled Caste category.

2. Mr. Joshi, learned advocate for the respondent nos.2 and 3 submits that the advertisement was issued in the year 2018 for filling in the post of Assistant Law Officer on contract basis. The advertisement itself clarified that the vacancy for

Scheduled Caste category is shown subject to approval by the Board of Director. The learned counsel submits that there was only one permanent post and one temporary post. One temporary post was filled in. The provisional post is not approved by the Board of Director.

3. We have considered the submissions.

4. As it is the advertisement in question was for appointment of Assistant Law Officer on contract basis. The period of contract was for two years. The said period has also come to an end. Moreover, affidavit has been filed by the respondent nos.2 and 3 stating that there was only one post available and the same has been filled in. The Board of Director has not approved the second post.

5. In light of that, no order can be passed in favour of the petitioner. The writ petition is disposed of. No costs.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

(ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE)