

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CONT. PETITION NO. 652 OF 2022
IN WP/1218/2013
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 5484 OF 2024
IN CP/652/2022

AMOL KAKASAHEB LEKURWALE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA THROUGH HON'BLE
ADVOCATE GENERAL AND OTHERS

...

Mr. V.D. Sapkal, Senior Advocate i/b Mr. Nitin Jagdale,
Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. S.J. Salgare, A.G.P. for respondent-State.

Mr. Rajendra Deshmukh, Senior Advocate (Special Counsel for
State.) a/w Advocate Mr. R.G. Dodiya.

...

CORAM : NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI AND
SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, JJ.

DATED : 9 JULY 2025

ORDER:-

1. This petition is filed for committing contempt of order dated 18.02.2022 passed by this Court. The following directions are given by this Court in the said order.

"The MPSC shall re-verify the entire documents of selected and appointed candidates. The Respondents have refuted the contention of the Petitioners. Upon re-verification if it is found that the candidates appointed did not possess the necessary experience or had submitted forged documents then shall take steps against them. Upon reverifying the documents and records if the Respondent / Authority arrives at conclusion that some of the candidates were not eligible to be appointed shall take appropriate steps against them. If the posts advertised under advertisements dated 21.12.2007, 11.02.2008 and 29.07.2008 due to non joining of selected candidates

are vacant or if some of the candidates appointed, upon re-verification of their documents are found to be not possessing necessary qualification or eligibility then on said post the MPSC / State Government may consider the petitioners or persons from the wait list of said advertisements for said posts of course in conformity with the eligibility, qualification and upon considering the category or reservation they had applied. Said exercise shall be done preferably within four (04) months”.

2. The Government, by filing affidavit, has stated that re-verification exercise is carried out, though not within stipulated time, but subsequently. In re-verification eight candidates were found ineligible. Their names were forwarded to MPSC. MPSC has recommended names of the candidates appearing in the wait list for appointment on these posts. Names of the petitioners could not be recommended as they were not found eligible as per merit.

3. Learned senior advocate for the petitioners makes a grievance that direction of this Court to fill up the posts from the petitioners or the wait listed candidates, is not complied with in true letter and spirit.

4. In view of the above referred affidavit, we do not find any substance in the said submission.

5. The respondents have complied with the order passed by this Court, Hence, contempt petition is disposed of.

6. In view of disposal contempt petition, pending civil application stands disposed of.

(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE)
JUDGE

(NITIN B. SURYAWANSHI)
JUDGE