IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

2 REVIEW APPLICATION (CIVIL) NO. 106 OF 2022
IN WP/4591/2011

DEEPAK GANPATRAO DONGARE
VERSUS
THE STATE OF MAHARASHTRA AND OTHERS

...
Advocate for applicant : Mr. Vivek V. Kabade
AGP for the respondent – State : Mr. N.S. Tekale
...

CORAM : KISHORE C. SANT AND JITENDRA JAIN, JJ.

DATE : 05 OCTOBER 2026

PER COURT :

Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned AGP for the State.

2. This Application is filed seeking review of the order dated 07.08.2025 passed by this Court in Writ Petition No. 4591 of 2011.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner points out paragraph no. 8 of the judgment, which reads as under:-

> "***8. As there is nothing on record t show that the petitioner was appointed after following due process of law pursuant to advertisement, the prayer of the petitioner cannot be considered with regard to giving benefits of permanent employee."***

4. He submits that in fact, the petitioner was appointed by following due process of law. There was advertisement issued in the

newspaper by the respondent calling for applications. Thereafter, he was called for the interview and it is only thereafter, he was selected. He also points out that the persons below him i.e. respondent no. 6 and 7 were regularised in service, whereas the petitioner was not regularised. He submits that in fact, when this material was on record, this Court, by overlooking the material, has made observations in paragraph no. 8 as above, which has caused serious prejudice to the petitioner. The applicant has placed on record copy of the writ petition with annexures. He, therefore prays to recall the order.

5. Learned AGP vehemently opposed the petition. He submits that no error apparent on the face of record is pointed out. This Application is filed on 07.08.2015, which was numbered only in 2022. It was first circulated in August – 2026. On 31.8.2026, this Court had directed the applicant to place on record the relevant documents. Copies of some documents are placed on record showing the advertisement published by the university, copy of the call letter etc.

6. Since the petition was disposed of in 2015, even in 2022, there was no record available of the petition. It was necessary for the applicant to get the Application circulated before the record could be destroyed. Along with the application, he has also not bothered to file any of the documents on which he wanted to rely.

7. It is only after this Court directed the applicant to place material documents, now copy of the writ petition is placed on record.

8. Under such circumstances, it cannot be verified as to whether the documents were on record. The Application is filed totally in a callous manner and deserves to be dismissed. The Application is dismissed. No order as to costs.

[JITENDRA JAIN]
JUDGE

[KISHORE C. SANT]
JUDGE

arp/