



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

WRIT PETITION NO. 5894 OF 2023

Manisha D/o. Naybrao Dabhade

.Vs.

General Manager, MSRTC, Mumbai and others

WITH

WRIT PETITION NO. 5896 OF 2023

Jaya D/o. Sakharam Awatirak

.Vs.

General Manager, MSRTC, Mumbai and others

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's Orders.

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr S. A. Nerkar, Advocate for the petitioners

Mr V. H. Kedar, Advocate for respondent Nos. 2 and 3

CORAM : ANIL S. KILOR AND

RAJNISH R. VYAS, JJ.

DATED : DECEMBER 15, 2025.

Heard.

2. The appointment on the post of Assistant (Junior) was denied to the petitioners for the reason that they do not fulfil the criteria as prescribed in the advertisement.

3. There is no dispute that for the post of Assistant (Junior) the requirement as per the advertisement was to have LMV driving licence. The petitioners do not possess the said licence. Furthermore, this requirement specified in the advertisement, was never challenged by the petitioners on any ground including the ground that such licence should not be asked for the post of Assistant (Junior).

4. Without raising any challenge to such requirement specified in the advertisement, the petitioner participated in the selection process and on being unsuccessful, filed the instant petition raising a ground that such requirement is not relevant and should not have been asked for the post of Assistant (Junior). Once the petitioners have participated in the process, such challenge cannot be considered after finding that the petitioners failed in the selection process.

5. In that view of the matter, we do not find any error committed by the respondents in denying appointment to the petitioners on the ground that the petitioners do not fulfil the qualifying criteria as mentioned in the advertisement.

6. Accordingly, both the writ petitions stand **dismissed**. No order as to costs.

[RAJNISH R. VYAS, J]

[ANIL S. KILOR, J.]