



1a

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

WRIT PETITION NO.60 OF 2021

Dr. Vinita Sanveevan

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Goa, thr. Its
Chief Secretary And 2 Ors.

... Respondents.

Mr S. D. Padiyar, Senior Advocate with **Mr Prayash P. Shirodkar, Advocate** for the Petitioner.

Mr Prashil Arolkar, Additional Government Advocate for Respondents No.1 and 3.

Mr Somnath B. Karpe, Advocate with **Mr Anand Shirodkar, Advocate** for Respondent No.2.

Mr J. E. Coelho Pereira, Senior Advocate with **Mr Vilas Pavithran, Advocate** for Respondent No.4.

CORAM

**: BHARATI DANGRE &
ASHISH S. CHAVAN, JJ.**

DATED

: 23rd SEPTEMBER, 2025.

ORAL ORDER: (Per. BHARATI DANGRE, J.)

1. An Advertisement No.4/2020 issued by the Goa Public Service Commission inviting applications to various posts in the Goa Dental College and Hospital which included the post of Lecturer in Public Health Dentistry. The applicant was one of the participant. It is however noted that the process under the said advertisement did not culminate into the appointment orders being issued but a fresh

advertisement vide No.1/2021 was issued on 05.01.2021. Pursuant to the said advertisement the application was filed by the Petitioner in form of Civil Application No.2279/2021(Filing) seeking restrain on the Respondents in appointing the selected candidate or the candidate nominated in terms of the said advertisement. Recording that the Petition is already admitted, the Court expressed its disinclination to consider the interim relief but passed the following:

“We are not inclined to consider the interim relief as prayed for in the aforesaid application. However, we make it clear that the appointment which will be issued for the post of Lecturer in the Public Health Dentistry (Unreserved), will be subject to the outcome of the main petition.”

2. Pursuant to the said direction, the Petitioner participated in the process that was conducted pursuant to the advertisement of 01/2021 but was not found to be suitable. In place, the Respondent No.4, who was found to be suitable, was selected and the appointment order was issued on 21.10.2021 and subject to the stipulations set out in the order of appointment, the Respondent No.4 is confirmed to the post of Lecturer of Public Health Dentistry.

3. On hearing the learned Senior Counsel, Mr Padiyar, when we have perused the pleadings, we find that the Petition seek quashing and setting aside the decision of the Respondent no.2 dated 20.02.2022 by which the process of selection pursuant to the advertisement no.4/2020 was discontinued. We find that there is no challenge to the process, emanating from advertisement no.01/2021 pursuant to which the Respondent No.4 is selected. Though the

Petition is admitted in the year 2021, according to us, it has been rendered infructuous in the wake of the subsequent events and since there is no challenge to the process initiated under the fresh advertisement and also to the appointment of Respondent No.4 pursuant to the selection initiated under the said advertisement.

4. Leaving it open to the Petitioner to raise a challenge to the process initiated under the fresh advertisement and also to the selection and appointment of Respondent No.4, if the Petitioner deem it appropriate, since we find that the process was initiated four years back and even an appointment order is issued in the year 2021 itself, subject to overcoming the hurdle of point of limitation, the Petitioner may think of filing a fresh Petition. However, at this stage, we deem it appropriate to dispose of the Writ Petition as the reliefs prayed for therein do not survive for adjudication.

ASHISH S. CHAVAN, J.

BHARATI DANGRE, J.