

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 10109 OF 2025

Jayashri Bhalchandra Kale

... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Maharashtra Thr.

Its Chief Secretary School

Education And Sport

Department And Ors.

... Respondents

Mr. Rajaram Deshmukh (Through VC), Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. Abhijeet Naik, AGP for Respondent Nos. 1 to 3 - State.

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE AND
ASHWIN D. BHOBE, JJ.**

DATE : 19th SEPTEMBER, 2025

P.C. :

1. This matter was heard for quite some time. In the TAIT, the Petitioner has scored 69 marks, out of 140. The grievance for preferring this Petition, is the alleged denial of access to the Pavitra Portal.

2. The Petitioner desires to seek employment for teaching the Marathi Subject. The TAIT, 2022 exam score of the Petitioner is 69. The Mula Gramin Shikshan Sanstha Management has filled up all the posts available and the last candidate has secured 96 marks. The PCMC

Institute has also filled up all the posts and the last candidate eligible for appointment has scored 112.

3. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner points out a GR dated 23/06/2017 and more particularly clause 3.6, which indicates that after the period prescribed in the advertisement is over, within 5 working days thereafter, each of the managements would declare their selected candidates by stating their marks, their stream, their category, their subject and the reservation roster. The grievance of the Petitioner is that those candidates, who are not selected are never informed, since clause 3.6 indicates that the selected candidates would be informed via email as well as registered post.

4. The learned AGP quickly points out that each candidate was sent an SMS message with a link. By opening the link, the candidate can peruse the entire result and he/she would be appraised of his/her standing in the select list.

5. The learned Advocate for the Petitioner points out that the Petitioner has applied for various Institutions. She is unaware of her other results. In such circumstances, we permit the Petitioner to go to the

website of each of these Institutions and note her result or serve an Application under the Right to Information Act and seek better details from the Institutions.

6. Considering that the Petitioner has scored much less marks as compared to the selected candidates in many educational Institutions, the learned Advocate for the Petitioner seeks leave to withdraw this Petition.

7. In view of the above, **this Petition is disposed off** as withdrawn, on instructions.

8. Needless to state, after the Petitioner gets further information from any Institution and it appears that she has scored more than the last selected candidate, she would be at liberty to avail of a remedy as is permissible in law.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)