



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
NAGPUR BENCH, AT NAGPUR.**

WRIT PETITION NO. 3927 OF 2024

(Sneha Tryambak Poharkar Vs. Union of India and another)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. Rajesh Punwatkar, Advocate for petitioner.
Mr. S.A. Chaudhari, Advocate for respondent No. 1.
Mr. Arun Patil, Advocate for respondent No. 3.

**CORAM : BHARATI DANGRE &
ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.**

DATED : 07-10-2024

1. The petition is filed seeking direction to the respondents to select him for the post of Head Constable (Veterinary) by setting aside impugned communication dated 9.4.2024, holding him to be ineligible.

By order dated 30.9.2024, we directed Mr. Patil, the learned Counsel for the respondent No. 3 – University, to ascertain whether the qualification possessed by the petitioner can be considered equivalent to the required eligibility criteria prescribed in the advertisement and his answer is in the negative.

2. We have perused the advertisement annexed at Annexure-P1 along with the petition and in particular, clause 5 which has prescribed eligibility condition for the post of Head Constable (Veterinary), which prescribe the professional qualification as below:

“(ii) Possess two years Diploma Course in Veterinary and Livestock Development or Veterinary Stock Assistant Course or Animal Husbandry Course from an institution recognized by the Central Government or State Government”.

3. As far as the petitioner is concerned, he is armed with a Diploma Certificate issued by the Maharashtra Animal & Fishery Sciences University, Nagpur in the “Livestock Management and Dairy Production”.

Definitely, this qualification is distinct from the one which is contemplated in the advertisement inviting applications for the post of Head Constable (Veterinary) and since respondent No. 3—the Maharashtra Animal & Fishery Sciences University, Nagpur specifically deny the equivalence, we cannot grant the relief prayed by the petitioner, i.e. setting aside of the impugned communication, informing him that he do not satisfy the eligibility criteria.

Upholding the said communication, the petition is dismissed.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

(BHARATI DANGRE, J.)