



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 4523 OF 2024

ROHINI BALAJIRAO LANGOTE @ ROHINI SANDIPAN MORE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

Mr. A. V. Indrale Patil, Advocate for the Petitioner
Mr. R. K. Ingole, AGP for Respondent/State

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE AND
R. M. JOSHI, JJ.

DATE : 30th APRIL, 2024

ORDER (PER - R. M. JOSHI, J.) :-

1. The Petitioner seeks to challenge the judgment and order dated 11th March, 2024 passed by Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal, Aurangabad in Original Application No. 264 of 2024 and also to set aside the appointment order issued in favour of Respondent No. 5 for the post of Police Patil of village Walag, Tq. Degloor, District Nanded.

2. The Petitioner had applied for the post of Police Patil in pursuant to the Advertisement dated 1st January, 2024 issued by the District Police Patil Bharti-2023/Controller Written Examination at District Collector, Nanded. It is alleged by the Petitioner that she was deliberately awarded less marks and was not called for interview. The Petitioner has objection for the appointment of Respondent No.5 and placement of Respondent No.6 in the waiting list contending that undue favour was shown to them

by the Appointing Authority. Being aggrieved by the same, Original Application No. 264 of 2024 came to be filed before the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal, Aurangabad. Learned Tribunal by passing impugned order rejected the application, hence this Petition.

3. We have heard the learned Advocate for the Petitioner and learned AGP for the Respondent/State, extensively and perused relevant record.

4. At the outset it needs to be recorded there is no dispute with regard to the fact that the entire process of examination for appointment to the post of Police Patil was computerized and there was absolutely no manual intervention permitted therein. In such circumstances, it does not stand to reason as to how less marks could be awarded particularly to the Petitioner or any undue advantage can be given to Respondent Nos. 5 and 6 as alleged by the Petitioner. Result of the examination shows that the Petitioner secured only 27 marks and due to which she was not called for viva-voce. There is nothing on record to indicate that Respondent Nos. 5 and 6 were illegally called for interview and one of them was given appointment order and other is placed in waiting list, sans merit. Once it is found that there was no manual intervention in the entire process, we find no reason to accept the contention of the Petitioner about she being deliberately given less marks and any undue

advantage was extended to Respondent Nos. 5 and 6.

5. We, therefore, do not find any substance in the Petition. In the result, **this Writ Petition stands dismissed.**

(R. M. JOSHI, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)

ssp