



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

WRIT PETITION NO. 1282 OF 2016

Datta Rangnath Zende

Age: 33 years, Occu.: Student,

R/o c/o Risala Bazar, Near Mahakali Temple,

Hingoli, Tq.. & Dist. Hingoli

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

Maharashtra State Power Generation

Co. Ltd. and Others

..RESPONDENTS

....

Mr. S.R. Sapkal, Advocate for petitioner

Ms. R.R. Tandale, A.G.P. for State

Mr. A.M. Gaikwad, Advocate for respondent no.1

Mr. V.C. Patil, Advocate for respondent no.8

....

CORAM : R.G. AVACHAT AND
SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, JJ.

DATE : 24th MARCH, 2025

PER COURT :

1. Heard.

2. Respondent No.1 – MSPGCL had advertised for recruitment of post of ‘Technician-3’ on 10th September, 2014. The petitioner was one of the candidates, who applied to the said post online. In the application, he claimed to have completed the training of one year under ‘Pragatkushal Prashikshan’. Then he also claimed to avail benefits of reservation.

3. Admittedly, the recruitment was outsourced and the documents regarding eligibility were to be scrutinised post the entire result was declared. After the selection process while the result was declared, the employer, through the outsourcing agency found the petitioner does not fall in any of the two reserved categories and his candidature was, therefore, turned down. In the advertisement itself three chances were given to the candidates to rectify their mistakes occurred in the application. If this was so, the petitioner did not rectify his application or applied for open category. Not rectifying the mistakes occurred in the application, inspite of there being opportunity, now for the first time before us he claims for considering his candidature from VJ General category.

4. Much water has flown post advertisement and recruitment process that took place way back in 2015. Respondent Nos.2 to 8 have already been recruited and serving with MSPGCL. Thereafter also 3-4 recruitment processes were undertaken. The petitioner even did not participate therein. For the mistakes committed by him while filling up the application, he shall blame to himself. After selection process while the result was declared, the employer, through the outsourcing agency found the petitioner does not fall in any of the two reserved categories and his candidature was, therefore, turned down inspite of him to have secured marks which would have made him eligible for appointment. Be that as it may. Since he committed mistake

in filling up the application and inspite of three chances for rectification, did not do needful, we are not inclined to grant the petitioner any relief. Writ petition is, therefore, dismissed.

SSD (SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.)

(R.G. AVACHAT, J.)