



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 2724 OF 2024

Ajit S/o Anil Khadatkhar Vs. Union of India, Through its Secretary for
Films Information and Technology Department and others

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, Appearances, Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders	Court's or Judge's orders
---	---------------------------

Mr. S.A. Marathe, Advocate for Petitioner
Mr. N.S. Deshpande, DSGI for Respondent No.1
Mr. R.P. Masurkar, Advocate for Respondent Nos.2 and 3

**CORAM: AVINASH G. GHAROTE AND
ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.**

DATED : 2nd MAY, 2025

1. Heard Mr. S.A. Marathe, learned counsel for the petitioner; Mr. Nandesh Deshpande, learned Deputy Solicitor General of India (DSGI) for the respondent No.1 and Mr. R.P. Masurkar, learned counsel for the respondent Nos.2 and 3.

2. The petition questions the final selection list of the selected candidates published on 17.04.2024 by the respondent No.2, in which the respondent no.4, has been shown to be the candidate from the Scheduled Caste category at Sr. No. 1 having secured the highest mark of 56.70% in the written test, interactive and interview, for the T.V. Wings PG Certificate Course.

3. Mr. Marathe, learned counsel for the petitioner submits, that the select list is flawed, for the

reason, that the petitioner, who had secured 54.25% marks, was in fact shown at Sr. No. 1, in the result dated 15.4.2024, whereas the respondent no.4 was shown at Sr. No. 12 in the category of unreserved candidates, for which he has invited to our attention to Annexure R-1 [page Nos.75 and 76]. He also invites our attention to the note-sheet at page 79, to contend, that the respondent no.4 continued in the same category.

4. Mr. Masurkar, learned counsel for the respondent No. 2 on the contrary submits that though the respondent no.4 was initially shown in the unreserved category, however, since this is a position which was found to be factually incorrect, a corrected list was published in which the respondent no.4, on the basis of the marks secured by him being the highest was placed at Sr. No.1 in the Scheduled Caste Category and granted admission. He submits, that such a course correction was permissible as that was factual position and nothing untoward claimed by the petitioner in that regard.

5. The details of marks secured by the candidates has been placed on record at page No. 83, which shows that the respondent no.4, had secured a total of 56.70% of marks, in the written test, inter-active and interview, as against which, the petitioner had secured 54.25% marks. Though the initial result published at page No. 76 on 15.04.2024, showed the petitioner at Sr. No. 1 in the category of SC candidates

shortlisted and the respondent no.4 at Sr. No. 12 in the category of short-listed candidates in the unreserved category, however, in this list itself, the respondent no.4 is shown to be a candidate from the SC category. It is also necessary to note, that the original application submitted by the respondent no.4 on 01.02.2024 which is placed on record at page 84 indicates, that he had submitted an application from the SC category [page 87] and that has also uploaded his caste certificate of belonging to “Mahar” Scheduled Caste [page 93]. This being the position, a course correction, by the respondent no.2 was clearly permissible, which was actually done on 17.4.2024 [page 83] which records, the respondent no.4 to be placed at Sr. No.1 in the merit list of SC category candidates. Merely because at one point of time, incorrectly the petitioner was shown at Sr. no.1, however, since the record demonstrates, that the respondent no.4 had applied from the SC category and had secured higher number of marks, it was in fact the respondent No.4 who was entitled to be granted admission, which has been so done. We, therefore, do not see any merits in the petition. The same is dismissed. No costs.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

(AVINASH G. GHAROTE, J.)