

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO.12105 OF 2024

Adit Arvind Latkar .. Petitioner
Vs.
The State of Maharashtra,
Through Higher & Technical Education Dept. & Ors. .. Respondents

Mr. Ashwin Kapadnis with Mr. Vivek Rane, Advocates for the Petitioner.
Mr. N.K. Rajpurohit, Assistant Government Pleader for Respondent No.1.
Ms. Dhruti Kapadia with Ms. Bharti Gerella, Advocates for Respondent No.2.

**CORAM : A.S. CHANDURKAR &
RAJESH S. PATIL, JJ**

DATE : 27TH AUGUST, 2024.

PC. :

1. The petitioner is aggrieved by the communication dated 22nd August 2024 issued by the 2nd respondent – Commissioner, State Common Entrance Test Cell, thereby refusing the petitioner's request to de-freeze his admission at the 3rd respondent – College so as to change his option.
2. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties we find that pursuant to the petitioner's application, he was provisionally allotted a seat at the 3rd respondent – College. In accordance with clause 1(d) of the allotment letter, the petitioner paid his seat acceptance fee on 16th August 2024. As a result, the seat acceptance was confirmed. It is thereafter that the petitioner realized that the said College was not satisfying his requirements and hence he made a request for changing the same.
3. In view of clause 9(2)(b) of the Information Brochure, such course is not permissible. There is no provision for de-freezing a choice already

made by accepting the seat. There is no fault whatsoever on the part of the State Common Entrance Test Cell, on the basis of which any interference can be caused. Merely on the basis of sympathy, we do not find that any relief can be granted to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the State Common Entrance Test Cell submits that as per clause 21 of the Admission Notice dated 6th August 2024, it is open for the petitioner to participate in the Institution level admission process.

5. In view of the aforesaid, we do not find any reason to interfere in exercise of writ jurisdiction. The writ petition is therefore dismissed.

[RAJESH S. PATIL, J.]

[A.S. CHANDURKAR, J.]