



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

1 WRIT PETITION NO.13907 OF 2025

Siddharth Sandeep Salve

....Petitioner

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra
Through Secretary And Others

.....Respondents

.....

Mr. Kadarale Nitin S. Bhagiratha, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. R. B. Dhaware, AGP for Respondents/State.

Mr. Sachin Kuptekar, Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.

.....

AND

2 WRIT PETITION NO.13910 OF 2025

Akash Jagannath Jadhav

....Petitioner

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Others

.....Respondents

.....

Mr. Kadarale Nitin S. Bhagiratha, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. A. M. Phule, AGP for Respondents/State.

Mr. Sachin Kuptekar, Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.

.....

AND

3 WRIT PETITION NO. 13918 OF 2025

Aman Chhotumiya Shaikh

....Petitioner

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra And Others

.....Respondents

.....

Mr. Kadarale Nitin S. Bhagiratha, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. R. B. Dhaware, AGP for Respondents/State.

Mr. Sachin Kuptekar, Advocate for Respondent Nos.3 and 4.

.....

**CORAM : SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI &
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 24 NOVEMBER 2025

ORDER :

. The present petitions have been filed for quashing and setting aside the communication as against the petitioners by respondent No.4 to respondent No.5 on 28.10.2025, whereby the provisional admission to the petitioners was cancelled.

2. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioners. Learned AGPs waive notice for respondent Nos.1 and 2 in respective petitions. Learned Advocate Mr. Sachin Kutekar waives notice for respondent Nos.3 and 4 in all the petitions.

3. Issue notice to respondent No.5, to be made returnable on 19.12.2025.

4. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioners that the petitioners admission has been cancelled on the ground that they have stated excess marks of graduation filled in their CAP admission form. The learned Advocate for the petitioners has tried to demonstrate as to what was the problem when the marks

were filled in at the time of filing of the application form of the admission. At this stage, we are not going into the details of it. The fact that has been brought on record is that the examination of the petitioners would start from today and then it is stated that as per the provisions in the brochure, the review applications in respect of all the three petitioners are pending with respondent No.4.

5. When the review is pending, then as per our *prima facie* impression, the admission ought not to have been cancelled, however, this aspect would be considered after the affidavit-in-reply on behalf of all the respondents is received.

6. We, therefore, by way of interim relief, direct respondent Nos.4 and 5 to allow the petitioners to appear for the exam, however, not to declare their result without the permission of this Court.

7. Affidavit-in-reply of respondent Nos.1 to 4, if any, to be filed within a period of two weeks from today. Copy of the same be given to the other side in advance.

8. We direct the learned Advocate appearing for respondent

No.4 to instruct respondent No.5 or where the exam is scheduled to permit the petitioners to appear for the exam starting from today.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

scm