

varsha

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 6696 OF 2025**

Shreyas Shrikant Kulkarni ... Petitioner

vs.

The State of Maharashtra through Secretary ... Respondents
and Ors

**WITH
WRIT PETITION NO. 6698 OF 2025**

Sachin Dilip Kadam ... Petitioner

vs.

The Secretary Maharashtra Public Service ... Respondents
Commission and Anr

Mr. Ritvik Joshi a/w. Mr. Akshay R. Kulkarni for Petitioner in both the
petitions.

Ms. Kavita Solunke, AGP for Respondent-State.

**CORAM : GAURI GODSE AND
SOMASEKHAR SUNDARESAN, JJ.
DATED : 29th MAY 2025
(VACATION COURT)**

ORDER:

1. These petitions are preferred to challenge the rejection of the interim relief prayed in the original application filed before the Maharashtra Administrative Tribunal ('MAT'). The petitioners

appeared for a written examination for the post of Administrative Officer, Group-B conducted by MPSC. The petitioners were declared ineligible on 9th May 2025 on the grounds of lack of supervisory experience. Hence, the petitioners approached the MAT. In the application, they prayed for interim relief seeking restraining orders to stop the selection process. The MAT had issued a notice in the main application, however, has rejected the prayer for interim relief. Hence, these petitions.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that as per the advertisement, the work experience required is not less than five years in the supervisory post in a government department or equivalent post under a local authority or in a managerial post in a business establishment.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner, i.e. Shreyas Shrikant Kulkarni is working as Auditor, Group-II in the supervisory and administrative capacity from 5th July 2010 in the department of Cooperation, Marketing and Textile, Government of Maharashtra. He further submits that the other petitioner i.e. Sachin D. Kadam is working as Accountant/Auditor, Class-III, Group-C in Mahabaleshwar Municipal Council, which is a supervisory and administrative post. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that

the necessary experience certificate is also produced at the time of filing application. He thus, submits that considering the experience certificate, the petitioners would be eligible to appear for the interview. However, the interview is already conducted on 13th May 2025. He further submits that the MPSC is likely to declare the result in the near future and the posts are likely to be filled up. He therefore submits that if the interim protection is not granted, the present petitions as well as the original application filed before the MAT would be rendered infructuous.

4. We have perused the papers. On perusal of the relevant clause in the advertisement and experience certificate, prima facie, we are of the view that the petitioners would be eligible for appearing for the interview for the post pursuant to the advertisement in question. In the event, the results are declared and the posts are filled in, the petitions are likely to be rendered infructuous.

5. A perusal of the impugned order rejecting interim relief does not indicate any reason for rejecting the interim relief. None appears for the MPSC, though copy is served privately.

6. Issue notice to the respondents returnable on 10th June 2025.

7. Learned AGP waives notice on behalf of respondent nos. 1

and 2.

8. In addition to the court notice, learned advocate for the petitioner to serve respondent no.3 by private notice and file affidavit of service before the next date.

9. In the meantime, till 13th June 2025, there will be ad-interim relief in terms of prayer clause(d) in both the petitions.

(SOMASEKHAR SUNDARESAN, J.)

(GAURI GODSE, J.)