



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

WRIT PETITION NO. 271 OF 2026

Sanskruti Narayan Kadam

VERSUS

The State Of Maharashtra Through The Principal Secretary And Others

Mr. N. D. Sonavane, Advocate for petitioner

Mr. S. B. Narwade, AGP for respondent Nos. 1 and 2

Mr. S. G. Karlekar, Advocate for respondent No. 3

Mr. C. A. Jadhav, Advocate for respondent No. 5

Mr. S. V. Avahane, Respondent No. 6 appears in person

**CORAM : Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi &
Hiten S. Venegavkar, JJ.**

DATE : 03rd February, 2026

PER COURT :-

1. Present petition has been filed for following reliefs :

A) Issue a writ of mandamus or writ in the nature of direction to the Respondent Nos. 3 and 4 to admit the Petitioner to the MBBS course under State Quota Female Category forthwith against the admission granted to respondent no. 5 admitted on the seat reserved for female category.

B) Issue a writ of mandamus or writ in the nature of direction to the Respondent No. 3 to hold the enquiry and to take immediate steps to grant admission to the petitioner at respondent no. 4 college for the seat reserved for female category as per grievance of the petitioner raised on 12.12.2025 (Exh. E).

2. Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner.

3. Learned AGP waives notice for respondent Nos. 1 and 2. Mr. Karlekar, learned Advocate, waives notice for respondent No. 3.

Mr. Jadhav, learned Advocate, waives notice for respondent No. 5 and respondent No. 6 is present in person.

4. Petitioner states that she had qualified National Eligibility cum Entrance Test (NEET) UG 2025 with 378 marks and was desirous of securing admission to the MBBS course in the respondent No. 4 Institution for the academic year 2025-2026 under the State Quota, specifically the female category seat in the Institutional Level Stray Vacancy Round. She applied as per the schedule prescribed by the respondent No. 2 vide notice dated 17.11.2025. She was duly included in the list of merit and waiting list. However, despite being a sole eligible female candidate in the relevant category present for spot admission on 20.11.2025, she was denied admission on the erroneous ground that she opted out of the seat, without any prior intimation or formal expression of unwillingness from her side. She submits that the institution was under obligation to follow the rules for the State Quota as well as Institutional Quota then the petitioner has described as to what had happened as per her version on the day 20.11.2025. She states that she was ready and willing to take admission, however it has been refused, but then she was served with private notice on 09.12.2025 by respondent No. 6 in Writ Petition No. 14120 of 2025, and then came to know that she was the only candidate from female category, but has not

been selected. Thereafter, she made oral inquiry with respondent No. 4 College and then came to know that a letter was given in her name that she was not interested in the vacant seat and she opted out. According to the petitioner, she has not given such letter. She then, filed grievance with the respondent No. 3 by sending email on 12.12.2025 and requesting it to held inquiry so also a request was made to cancel the admission of respondent No. 5 who is the male candidate and has been given admission by the respondent No. 4. Now, it has been submitted on behalf of the petitioner that though the prayer is for direction to respondent Nos. 3 and 4 to admit the petitioner to the MBBS course, the respondent No. 3 has to held the inquiry and take immediate steps in respect of the act done by respondent No. 4 and therefore, the petitioner is restricting the petition to the extent of prayer clause 'B'.

5. Learned Advocate, Mr. Karlekar, appearing for respondent No. 3 submits that respondent No. 3 would take the decision within a period of 8 weeks. He submits that though the respondent No. 5 might have been admitted his admission, is not yet approved, and therefore, the respondent No. 3 would make an inquiry in view of the grievance that has been raised.

6. We take the aforesaid statement as undertaking and dispose

of the petition by directing the respondent No. 3 to hold an inquiry in view of the grievance raised by the petitioner on 12.12.2025. We expect that the said inquiry then might not be restricted to a literal words used in the grievance raised by her on 12.12.2025, but it should be in respect of the process of admission adopted by the respondent No. 4.

(Hiten S. Venegavkar, J.)

(Smt. Vibha Kankanwadi, J.)

B. S. Joshi